

From: [Carmen Taylor](#)
To: [Mailroom Mailbox](#)
Cc: [Anna Wilkes](#)
Subject: Proposed Plan Change 7 to the LWRP and Proposed Plan Change 2 to the Waimakariri River Regional Plan - Submission from Ravensdown Limited
Date: Thursday, 12 September 2019 9:48:00 AM

Hi

Please find attached Ravensdown Limited's submission on Proposed Plan Change 7 to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan and Proposed Plan Change 2 to the Waimakariri River Regional Plan.


Regards, Carmen



Carmen Taylor - Associate

DDI: 03 929 1414 M: 021 312 781 E: carmen@planzconsultants.co.nz W: planzconsultants.co.nz
A: 8 Stafford Street, Dunedin 9016

Notice: The information in this email is confidential and is intended only for the use of the addressee named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, copying or use of this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please reply to the author by return email, and delete the original message. Thank you.

 Please consider the environment before printing this email.

**SUBMISSIONS ON
PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 7 TO THE CANTERBURY LAND AND WATER
REGIONAL PLAN**

AND

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 2 TO THE WAIMAKARIRI RIVER REGIONAL PLAN

TO: Canterbury Regional Council (**Council**)
PO Box 345
CHRISTCHURCH 8140
Via email: mailroom@ecan.govt.nz

SUBMITTER: Ravensdown Limited (**Ravensdown**)
292 Main South Road
PO Box 1059
CHRISTCHURCH 8140
Contact: Anna Wilkes
Environmental Policy Specialist
Mobile: 021 229 0439
Email: anna.wilkes@ravensdown.co.nz

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE: Planz Consultants Limited (**Planz**)
PO Box 1845
CHRISTCHURCH 8140
Contact: Carmen Taylor
Consultant Planner
Mobile: 021 312 781
Email: carmen@planzconsultants.co.nz

1. INTRODUCTION

Ravensdown Limited – Overview and Interests in the Canterbury Region

- 1.1 Ravensdown Limited (**Ravensdown**) is a farmer owned co-operative. Ravensdown's goal is to enable smarter farming for a better New Zealand. Given this goal, Ravensdown provides products, namely fertiliser and agrochemicals (agrichemicals), expertise and technology to help farmers reduce environmental impacts and to optimise value, or outputs, from land.
- 1.2 Ravensdown, in deciding whether to participate in regional planning processes, considers whether the plan, or proposed plan change, will achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**) while also evaluating whether the planning provisions will unduly constrain its own activities (i.e., manufacturing, store sites and quarries) and/or the users of their products (i.e., its farming shareholders).
- 1.3 In this context, the nature of Ravensdown's interests in the Canterbury region includes the Christchurch manufacturing site at Hornby, various bulk stores and two lime quarries near Rangiora and Geraldine. More specifically, in the Waimakariri sub-region, as covered by Section 8 of the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (**LWRP**), Ravensdown's interest includes the Whiterock lime quarry at Whiterock near Rangiora. In the Orari-Temuka-Opihi-Pareora (**OTOP**) sub-region, as covered by Section 14 of the LWRP, Ravensdown's interests include the Geraldine lime quarry on Winchester Hanging Rock Road and the Seadown bulk fertiliser store near Timaru. In addition, through Ravensdown Environmental, Ravensdown assists its shareholders and others to meet regional planning requirements through the provision of farm environment services, which include nutrient loss and mitigation modelling (including OVERSEER Nutrient Budgeting), Farm Environment Plan (**FEP**) development and associated resource consent planning services.
- 1.4 Given the nature of Ravensdown's activities in the region, Ravensdown seeks to ensure that the Proposed Plan Change 7 (**PPC7**) to the LWRP and Proposed Plan Change 2 (**PPC2**) to the Waimakariri River Regional Plan (**WRRP**) promotes the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, in this instance, the region's land and water resources, particularly in the Waimakariri and OTOP sub-regions. This includes the ability to continue to use and develop resources, including the rural land resource, while ensuring that adverse effects of activities are avoided, remedied or mitigated.
- 1.5 Given the above context, the provisions of PPC7 to the LWRP and PPC2 to the WRRP are of interest to Ravensdown given its activities in the region and the nature of farming activities undertaken by its farming shareholders in the region, as outlined in **paragraph 1.3** above. Therefore, in preparing this submission, Ravensdown has focussed on the proposed provisions that apply to farming activities (including commercial vegetation growing operations), including nutrient management and fertiliser use, as well as the proposed provisions that may apply to its lime quarries and bulk stores (including the Seadown bulk fertiliser store).

Overview of Submission

- 1.6 Ravensdown's submission, given its key interests in the Canterbury region and the potential implications of PPC7 of the LWRP and PPC2 of the WRRP to the farming community, generally supports PPC7 in terms of its goal to improve freshwater outcomes for the region. This includes requiring farming activities to implement Good Management Practices (**GMP**), to prepare and

implement FEPs and either comply with permitted activity rules or resource consent conditions as a means of reducing diffuse nutrient discharges. PPC2 to the WRRP is supported as it ensures that any potential inconsistencies between the WRRP and the Waimakariri sub-region provisions of the LWRP (as contained in Section 8 of the LWRP) are removed.

- 1.7 However, through these submissions, Ravensdown seeks amendments that enable Ravensdown, its shareholders and the users of its products to continue to use and develop resources in the region in a manner that continues to provide for the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, including the region's land and water resource, while also ensuring that adverse effects on the environment are avoided, remedied or mitigated.
- 1.8 Ravensdown's submissions on PPC7 and PPC2 are structured as follows:
 - (a) General comments, including the areas of support and key areas of concern where Ravensdown seeks amendments to provisions, are overviewed in **Section 2** of this submission;
 - (b) Specific submission points on the provisions of PPC7 to the LWRP are contained in the table provided in **Attachment A**;
 - (c) Specific submission points on the provisions of PPC2 to the WRRP are contained in the table provided in **Attachment B**; and
 - (d) A conclusion, including the overarching reasons for the submission, is provided in **Section 3**.

2. GENERAL COMMENTS

Relevant Draft National Instruments

- 2.1 Ravensdown acknowledges that the Draft National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (**Draft NPS-FM**), Draft Proposed National Environment Standards for Freshwater (**Draft NES-FW**) and Draft Stock Exclusion Regulations (**Draft Stock Exclusion Regs**), which were released on 5 September 2019 by Central Government as part of its 'Action for Healthy Waterways' consultation process, once finalised and gazetted, may have implications for PPC7.
- 2.2 While this fact is acknowledged, given that the final form of these national provisions will not be known until they are gazetted, Ravensdown has not considered the requirements of these draft provisions in the preparation of these submission points. However, Ravensdown may take the opportunity to refer to the requirements of these national instruments, once they are gazetted, as PPC7 proceeds through the Schedule 1 of the RMA process.
- 2.3 Ravensdown's approach to these national instruments in the context of PPC7 is considered to be consistent with Council's position. In an email (dated 6 September 2019) to parties interested in PPC7 (including Ravensdown), Council advised that the notification of these national instruments, for the purposes of public consultation, do not affect PPC7. Council also advised that future plan changes will address the requirements of these national instruments, as necessary, after they are finalised (and gazetted). However, Council acknowledged, that if these national instruments are gazetted before decisions are made on PPC7, then the provisions

of the national instruments and relevance to PPC7 are likely to be considered where it is appropriate to do so.

Areas of Support

- 2.4 Ravensdown supports the intent of PPC7 to the LWRP and PPC2 to the WRRP to provide for the use and development of the region's land and water resources, subject to a management framework, while aiming to ensure that the freshwater outcomes for the region are improved. While the overall approach and intent of the plan changes are supported, amendments to the plan change provisions are requested to address the matters raised in this submission.
- 2.5 In relation to PPC7 to the LWRP provisions, Ravensdown supports:
- (a) The provision of region-wide Commercial Vegetable Growing Operation (**CVGO**) provisions which recognise the nature of such activities and the need to provide an appropriate resource management framework for managing CVGO activities sustainably within the region.
 - (b) The provision of an alternative consent pathway, as provided for by way of a relevant policy and associated rules, within the OTOP and Waimakariri sub-regions in circumstances where Council's Farm Portal cannot accurately generate the required Baseline GMP Loss Rate or Good Management Practice Loss Rate.
 - (c) The application of a generally consistent farming activity rule hierarchy throughout the region, including within the Waimakariri and OTOP sub-regional rules.
 - (d) The requirement for farming activities, including CVGO, to implement GMP and to prepare and implement FEPs and/or Management Plans, in accordance with Schedule 7A of the LWRP, for some permitted farming activities.
 - (e) The amendments to region-wide provisions to rectify or address consistency issues that were evident in the operative provisions, or that have the potential to arise as a result of PPC7 provisions.
- 2.6 In relation to PPC2 provisions, Ravensdown supports the proposed amendments as they ensure that inconsistencies between the WRRP and the LWRP do not arise.

Areas of Concern

Farm Portal

- 2.7 Ravensdown holds concerns regarding PPC7's reliance on the Farm Portal to generate GMP loss rates that farmers are required to adhere to through their farming land use consents.
- 2.8 Ravensdown was one of a number of appellants on Plan Change 5 (**PC5**) to the LWRP who sought amendments to flawed proxies for both irrigation and fertiliser within the Farm Portal. These proxies result in erroneous GMP nitrogen loss rates being generated by the Farm Portal which, if not properly understood, can have severe impacts on a farmer's ability to operate.
- 2.9 As part of the appellants' decision to withdraw their appeals on PC5, a Memorandum of Understanding was signed with Council to establish a working group to attempt to resolve the proxy issues in the Farm Portal. Extensive time was spent by the appellants and their technical representatives through a number of workshops. The workshops confirmed that the nitrogen

fertiliser proxy in the Farm Portal was not fit for purpose to calculate GMP nitrogen loss rates from Overseer model output files and recommended that the fertiliser proxy should be disabled in the Farm Portal. The recommendations to Council included that PPC7 should be delayed until the issues were resolved given the significant implications on reduction regimes for farmers.

- 2.10 Council considered the recommendations of the working group and acknowledged that the nitrogen fertiliser proxies can contribute to erroneous nitrogen loss rate figures. However, Council determined that disabling the nitrogen fertiliser proxies in the Farm Portal was not possible because it would require a plan change and Council is required to retain a Farm Portal that reflects the requirements of Schedule 28 of the LWRP.
- 2.11 Ravensdown is concerned the Farm Portal, with flawed proxies, is proposed to be relied on in PPC7. Under PC5, the ongoing issues with the Farm Portal have resulted in many consent applications being processed under the equivalent pathway, rather than through the Farm Portal, as anticipated within PC5.

Proposed Commercial Vegetable Growing Operations

- 2.12 While Ravensdown supports the region-wide CVGO provisions that reflect the nature of CVGO activities, while putting in place restrictions and controls to ensure that adverse nutrient effects are minimised, there are three areas of concern raised by Ravensdown within this submission.
- 2.13 These areas of concern relate to: avoiding CVGO expansion; the use of term 'lawful nitrogen loss rate' within the CVGO provisions; and, the proposed constraining of CVGO activities within a single nutrient allocation zone or sub-region.
- 2.14 Firstly, Ravensdown considers that while it may be appropriate to restrict new or expanded CVGO activities (unless certain criteria are met), the policy framework of PPC7 should not refer to avoiding new or expanded CVGO activities as stated in part (b) of Policy 4.36A. While Ravensdown recognises that control of new or expanded operations, to provide the sustainable management of the region's land and water resources, is important, it is also important to recognise that there is a need to continue to grow food to meet the current and future needs of New Zealand's and the world's growing population.
- 2.15 The term 'lawful nitrogen loss rate' is used in CVGO Policy 4.36A and the subsequent CVGO rules. The CVGO provides that new or expanded CVGO activities (i.e., beyond the 'baseline commercial vegetable growing area') are to be 'avoided' (or restricted as proposed by Ravensdown) unless the nitrogen losses from such an activity can be accommodated within the 'lawful nitrogen loss rate'. Ravensdown supports the intent of this provision. However, as the term is not defined in the LWRP or PPC7, it is not clear what is actually meant by this term. Accordingly, a definition, to provide the necessary clarity, has been requested.
- 2.16 The third area of concern relates to part (d) of Policy 4.36A, and subsequent relevant CVGO rules. Part (d) of Policy 4.36A identifies that CVGO activities, as far as practicable, are to be constrained within a single allocation zone or sub-region. While Ravensdown accepts that this approach maybe be easier in terms of Council's ability to assess an application (i.e., against the relevant nutrient limits), it is considered that this should not be a restriction placed on CVGO operations. Rather, it is considered that managing the issues associated with cross-boundary activities (and consent applications), while challenging, can be achieved. Therefore, identifying

within this policy and subsequent rules that such activities should be restricted is not appropriate.

- 2.17 Specific amendments to CVGO provisions, to address these areas of concern, are contained in specific submissions points contained in **Attachment A** of this submission.

Orari-Temuka-Opihi-Pareora Sub-region (Section 14 of the LWRP) – High Nitrogen Concentration Areas and Staged Reductions

- 2.18 Within the OTOP sub-region, Ravensdown acknowledges that the Rangitata Orton, Fairlie Basin and Levels Plain areas are characterised by elevated nitrate levels. Given this issue, the identification of the three High Nitrogen Concentration Areas (**HNCA**), associated water quality targets and a planning framework which aims to reduce nitrate in the HNCAs to achieve these targets is considered appropriate. This approach is also consistent with recommendations of the Orari-Temuka-Opihi-Pareora Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (**OTOP ZIPA**) dated December 2018.
- 2.19 In relation to farming activities within the HNCAs, Ravensdown supports the need for farming activities to reduce diffuse nitrogen losses in accordance with GMP and through associated actions identified in a FEP. Ravensdown also considers that a nitrogen loss reduction, by 2030, of 15% for dairy farming activities and 5% for other farming activities should be achievable. However, while these proposed reductions may be achievable, Ravensdown also considers that it is important to recognise that these reductions may be challenging for some farmers, will have the potential to erode land values and may affect some farmers' ability to remain in business.
- 2.20 Given these concerns, Ravensdown does not support continued staged nitrogen loss reductions (beyond the proposed 15% and 5% respectively for dairy and other farming activities by 2030) as now proposed in Table 14(zc) of PPC7. Rather, Ravensdown considers that the focus of the OTOP sub-regional provisions in relation to farming activities and the reduction of nitrogen losses should be on achieving the freshwater outcomes being sought (i.e., achieving the water quality targets). In this context, if in the future, the water quality monitoring programme identifies that these targets have not been achieved, then the way forward is a matter for consideration under a new plan change process.
- 2.21 For the above reasons, in the specific submission points contained in **Attachment A**, Ravensdown has requested the deletion of Table 14(zc) and has also requested amendments to associated references to continued percentage nitrogen loss reductions by farming activities (while also seeking nitrogen loss reductions, by 2030, of 15% for dairy farming activities and 5% for other farming activities).
- 2.22 In relation to industrial activities in the Levels Plain HNCA, where Ravensdown's Seadown store is located, Ravensdown recognises the need for industrial activities to share the burden of achieving water quality targets with farming activities. However, for some industrial activities an absolute 30% reduction may be challenging. Therefore, an amendment to Policy 14.4.41 is requested in **Attachment A**, consistent with the relevant OTOP ZIPA recommendation, requiring industrial activities to reduce nitrogen losses by up to 30% below relevant consent limits.

Waimakariri Sub-region (Section 8 of the LWRP) – Nitrate Priority Area and Staged Reductions

- 2.23 There are two broad areas of concern associated with the Waimakariri sub-region provisions of PPC7, namely the proposed Nitrate Priority Area (**NPA**) and the proposed continued staged nutrient reductions for farming activities.
- 2.24 Ravensdown generally supports the identification of the NPA, and aspects of the proposed resource management approach, within the Waimakariri sub-region, given some of the water quality issues in this area. Given the issues within the NPA, Ravensdown supports the identification of this area as a planning tool to be used to trigger a more focussed regulatory framework for the reduction of nitrates.
- 2.25 While Ravensdown supports the inclusion of the NPA as part of the management framework of PPC7 for the Waimakariri sub-region, Ravensdown does have concerns around a broader reliance on this tool, in terms of the areas reported connection to the aquifer that supplies water to Christchurch City. In regard to this matter, Ravensdown is aware of additional analysis commissioned by DairyNZ which suggests that the potential connection between the NPA and the Christchurch aquifer, as outlined in the Waimakariri Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (**Waimakariri ZIPA**) and the section 32 Report, may be more nebulous than reported.
- 2.26 Given these concerns, Ravensdown opposes the notified extent of the NPA as it extends in places, particularly the northern boundary, beyond that identified in the Waimakariri ZIPA. Also, the Waimakariri ZIPA did not identify sub-areas A to E as proposed in PPC7. As the scientific justification for these changes may not be well founded, Ravensdown considers that the extent of the NPA should be consistent with that identified in the Waimakariri ZIPA (i.e., with no sub-areas). This is principally due to the potential issues associated with modelling that underpins the identification of these areas, as well as the fact that Waimakariri ZIPA effectively advised the farming community covered by the identified area of the potential future implications for their farming activities.
- 2.27 In relation to farming activities in the sub-region, as stated above in relation to the OTOP sub-region, Ravensdown supports the development and use of FEPs (and the implementation of GMP), as incorporated into the LWRP, as a means of identifying and managing the actual and potential effects on the environment of farming activities.
- 2.28 Following the same rationale as outlined above in relation to the OTOP sub-region, Ravensdown supports the need to reduce nitrate losses within the NPA and considers that reductions of 15% for dairy farming activities and 5% for other farming activities, by 2030, should be achievable. However, Ravensdown recognises that these reductions will be challenging for many farmers and that they have the potential to impact on business viability. Ravensdown also considers that reductions, including continued percentage reduction requirements, need to be scientifically based having considered the economic and practical implications associated with the proposal. On this basis, the arbitrary continued percentage reductions proposed in the draft Waimakariri ZIPA was opposed by Ravensdown and continues to be opposed now that this concept has been incorporated into PPC7.
- 2.29 Given the concerns outlined above, Ravensdown does not support the continued staged reductions outlined in Table 8-9 of PPC7 and considers that this table should be deleted along

with all requirements to implement staged nutrient reductions in accordance with this table. If in the future, the water quality monitoring programme identifies that these targets have not been achieved, then the way forward is a matter for consideration under a new plan change process.

- 2.30 On this basis, Ravensdown, in specific submission points in relation to Waimakariri sub-region farming activities, has requested amendments that ensure that the focus is on achieving the freshwater outcomes being sought (i.e., achieving the water quality targets and achieving the proposed reductions of 15% and 5% by 2030) rather than focussing on the percentage reductions outlined in Table 8-9.
- 2.31 Specific amendments to Waimakariri sub-region provisions, to address these areas of concern, are contained in specific submissions points contained in **Attachment A** of this submission.
- 2.32 Finally, Ravensdown recognises that the reduced threshold of 5ha for farming activities and associated lower winter grazing thresholds in the Waimakariri sub-region arises out of a recommendation in the Waimakariri ZIPA (Rec. 3.11) to reduce nitrates within the sub-region. The Waimakariri ZIPA identifies that the reason for this recommendation is modelling has suggested that lowering of the winter grazing could cumulatively contribute to a significant reduction in the amount of nitrate entering groundwater, rivers and the Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka). Given the identified nitrate issues within this sub-region, Ravensdown does not oppose the proposed threshold reductions. However, Ravensdown wishes to identify that this proposed approach has the potential to result in a disparity issue between the farmers in the Waimakariri sub-region and the rest of the Canterbury region.

3. CONCLUSION

- 3.1 Ravensdown generally supports PPC7 to the LWRP and PPC2 to the WRRP, subject to the amendments requested to address the concerns raised within its submission. In relation to the provisions that Ravensdown has raised concerns about, those provisions require amendment because, without amendment, those provisions:
- (a) will not promote sustainable management of resources and will not achieve the purpose of the RMA;
 - (b) is contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA;
 - (c) will not enable the social and economic well-being of the community of the Canterbury region;
 - (d) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations;
 - (e) will not achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development or protection of the region's land and water resources;
 - (f) will not enable the efficient use and development of Ravensdown's assets and operations, and of those resources which are dependent on, or benefit from, Ravensdown's assets and operations; and
 - (g) do not represent the most appropriate means of exercising Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.

- 3.2 Ravensdown could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
- 3.3 Ravensdown wishes **to be heard** in support of its submissions.
- 3.4 If others are making a similar submission, Ravensdown will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

Date: 12 September 2019



.....
Carmen Taylor

Consultant Planner (Associate)

Authorised to sign this submission on behalf of Ravensdown Limited

ATTACHMENT A – RAVENSDOWN LIMITED’S SUBMISSIONS ON PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 7 TO THE CANTERBURY LAND AND WATER REGIONAL PLAN

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 7A (OMNIBUS)					
Section 2 – How the Plan Works & Definitions					
A01	Section 2.8 – Relationship with other regional plans controlling land and water	10	Support	<p>The Proposed Plan Change 7 (PPC7) amendments to this section of the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (LWRP) identifies that the Opihi River Regional Plan and Pareora Catchment Environmental Flow and Water Allocation Regional Plan will be rescinded once PPC7 is operative and that the sub-regional provisions of the LWRP will regulate activities in these catchments.</p> <p>PPC7 also identifies that the LWRP applies to the activities in the Waimakariri River catchment, except for the specific activities identified in this section of PPC7.</p> <p>The clarity and consistency provided to resource users by these amendments is appropriate.</p>	Retain the amendments to Section 2.8 of the LWRP as notified.
A02	Definition – Baseline commercial vegetable growing area	11	Support in part	<p>The definition, given its connection to one of the mechanisms that underpins the rules that apply to commercial vegetation growing operations (CVGO) in the region, is generally appropriate.</p> <p>However, amendments to the definition are considered necessary so as to accurately reflect the role of this term within the PPC7 provisions. Ravensdown understands that the intent is to ‘ring fence’, for the purposes of providing for or restricting CVGO within PPC7 rules, the maximum total and aggregated area of land associated with past CVGO in the region during a relevant 12 month period between 2009 to 2013. On this basis, amendments to the definition to provide more clarity in relation to</p>	<p>Amend the notified definition of ‘baseline commercial vegetable growing areas’ as follows:</p> <p><i>“means the <u>maximum total</u> aggregated area of land used for a commercial vegetable growing operation in any 12 month consecutive period within the period of 1 January 2009 to 31 December 2013 and under the control (owned or leased) of a single grower or enterprise.”</i></p>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				this intent is required.	
A03	Definition – Commercial vegetable growing operation	11	Support	<p>The definition of CVGO identifies that in the context of PPC7 these operations relate to the growing of vegetables for human consumption for commercial gain.</p> <p>Given this definition, the CVGO provisions of PPC7 do not apply to vegetable growth for personal consumption (and/or the non-commercial provision to family and friends) or growth of plants or vegetables that are not for human consumption (i.e., for stock feed or seed potatoes which would be subject to the ‘farming activity’ provisions of PPC7 and LWRP).</p> <p>On the above basis, the definition of CVGO is appropriate.</p>	Retain the definition of ‘commercial vegetable growing operation’ as notified.
A04	New definition – lawful nitrogen loss rate	-	-	<p>The CVGO specific policy and rule provisions of PPC7 refer to the term ‘lawful nitrogen loss rate’. This is not a term that is defined in the operative LWRP or in PPC7. The meaning, and thus implications, of this term is not necessarily evident within PPC7, nor is it discussed within the section 32 Report.</p> <p>The provision, through a definition, of clarity around what this term means in the context of the CVGO provisions of PPC7 is considered necessary.</p>	Provide a definition of ‘lawful nitrogen loss rate’ in the context of how this definition applies to the CVGO provisions of PPC7.
Section 4 - Policies					
A05	Nutrient Management – Policy 4.36A	17	Support in part	This policy appropriately recognises that CVGO have specific requirements that do not fit within the region-wide and sub-regional nutrient management provisions of the LWRP. The policy outlines that a nutrient management framework for CVGO, which are effectively standalone provisions for nutrient management that apply on a region-wide basis, is	<p>Amend Policy 4.36A as follows:</p> <p><i>“Recognise the particular constraints that apply to commercial vegetable growing operations (including the need to rotate crops to avoid soilborne diseases and for growing locations in close proximity to processing facilities) and provide a nutrient management framework that</i></p>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				<p>required so as to recognise the needs of CVGO while ensuring that water quality is improved or maintained.</p> <p>The nutrient management approach outlined within this policy identifies that CVGO, under PPC7, will be: required to operate at good management practice (GMP); restricted to the baseline commercial vegetable growing area (as defined above – Sub. Ref. A02) unless the nitrogen losses can be accommodated within the ‘lawful nitrogen loss rate’ (Sub. Ref. A04); required to identify how nitrogen loss reductions will be achieved; constrained, where practicable, within single nutrient allocation zones or sub-regions; and, prepare and implement a Farm Environment Plan (FEP).</p> <p>The reason for, intent and guidance provided by this policy is considered an appropriate resource management approach to the challenges associated with managing diffuse nutrient discharges from CVGO. In addition, the requirement to operate at GMP and in accordance with a FEP that identifies actions for reducing nutrient losses is also supported. However, amendments to parts (b) and (d) of this policy are proposed.</p> <p>In relation to part (b), it is considered that avoidance of new or expanded CVGO operations is not an appropriate focus, especially as there is a continuing need to grow food to meet the needs of New Zealand’s growing population as well as international demand for our produce. However, it is acknowledged, that that it may be appropriate to restrict new or expanded operations unless the operation can demonstrate that there is no increase</p>	<p><i>appropriately responds to and accommodates these constraints while improving or maintaining water quality by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. requiring commercial vegetable growing operations to operate at good management practice;</i> <i>b. avoiding restricting the establishment of a new commercial vegetable growing operation, or any expansion of an existing commercial vegetable growing operation beyond the baseline commercial vegetable growing area, unless the nitrogen losses from the operation can be accommodated within the lawful nitrogen loss rate applicable to the new location;</i> <i>c. requiring commercial vegetable growing operations to demonstrate, at the time of application for resource consent and at the time of any Farm Environment Plan audit, how any relevant nutrient loss reduction set out in Sections 6 to 15 of this Plan will be achieved;</i> <i>d. constraining, as far as practicable, commercial vegetable growing operations to a single nutrient allocation zone or sub-region; and</i> <i>de. requiring a Farm Environment Plan as part of any application for resource consent, and requiring that Farm Environment Plan to be prepared in accordance with Schedule 7 of this Plan”</i>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				<p>in nitrogen losses as a whole.</p> <p>In relation to part (d), while acknowledging that it may be easier to assess an application, and therefore administer PPC7 and the LWRP, if a CVGO is located within one nutrient allocation zone or sub-region, this should not be a restriction placed on CVGO operations. It is considered that managing the issues associated with cross-boundary activities (and within consent applications and resource consents), while challenging, is achievable and therefore such activities should not be unduly restricted. For this reason, it is considered that part (d) of this policy is unnecessary and should be deleted.</p>	
A06	Submission of Water Quality Data – Policy 4.103	20	Support in part	<p>It is acknowledged that it is important that Council is able to receive and upload water quality data, for the public to access, in a consistent and timely manner. However, it may not always be possible for consent holders to provide the data in the manner required by this policy.</p> <p>On this basis, the policy should recognise that consideration will need to be given to the feasibility of applying standard data provision conditions when resource consent conditions are being drafted.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 4.103 as follows:</p> <p><i>“Any resource consent granted with a consent condition requiring the collection of water quality samples, shall also include a condition requiring, <u>where feasible</u>, all water quality sample data to be submitted to the Canterbury Regional Council in a format suitable for automated upload to the Council’s water quality database software”</i></p>
Section 5 – Region-wide Rules					
A07	Offal and Farm Rubbish Pits – Rule 5.26A (discretionary activity rule)	27	Support	<p>PPC7 introduces new Rule 5.26A which applies a discretionary activity status to offal pits that do not meet the conditions of Rule 5.26. Rule 5.26 provides for this activity, as a restricted discretionary activity, provided the disposal and discharge are the subject of a FEP prepared in accordance with Schedule 7A.</p> <p>The PPC7 amendment appropriately addresses a gap in the operative LWRP where the activity status of</p>	Retain Rule 5.26A, including the rule’s discretionary activity status, as notified.

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				offal pit activities, where they are not provided for by Rules 5.24 to 5.26, is clarified. Discretionary activity status is considered appropriate in this instance.	
A08	Silage Pits and Compost – Rule 5.40A (non-complying activity rule)	29	Support	<p>PPC7 introduces new Rule 5.40A which applies a non-complying activity status to silage pits or the stockpiling of other decaying organic matter that does not meet the conditions of Rule 5.40. Rule 5.40 provides for these activities, as restricted discretionary activities, provided these activities are the subject of a FEP prepared in accordance with Schedule 7A.</p> <p>The PPC7 amendment appropriately addresses a gap in the operative LWRP where the activity status of these activities, where they are not provided for by Rules 5.38 to 5.40, is clarified. Non-complying activity status is considered appropriate in this instance.</p>	Retain Rule 5.40A, including the rule's non-complying activity status, as notified.
A09	All Nutrient Allocation Zones – Rule 5.41 (permitted activity)	29 and 30	Support	PPC7 introduces a suite of region-wide rules that apply to commercial vegetable growing operations (Rules 5.42CA to 5.42CE). Rule 5.41 has been amended to clarify that despite these new rules (and relevant operative rules), farming activities that comply with the conditions of Rule 5.41 are permitted activity. This clarification is required for PPC7 and the LWRP to work effectively.	Retain the amendment to Rule 5.41 as notified.
A10	Commercial Vegetable Growing Operations - Rule 5.42CA (permitted activity)	30	Support	<p>Proposed new permitted activity Rule 5.42CA permits all commercial vegetable growing operations on a property of 0.5ha or less. There are no conditions attached to this rule.</p> <p>This rule provides for relatively small-scale CVGO activities located on one property. It is appropriate to provide for these smaller scale CVGO as a permitted activity.</p>	Retain Rule 5.42CA, including the rule's permitted activity status, as notified.

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
A11	Commercial Vegetable Growing Operations - Rule 5.42CB (restricted discretionary activity)	30	Support in part	<p>Restricted discretionary activity status for CVGO in the region that are not permitted by Rule 5.42CA is consistent with the rule hierarchy applied to other farming activities under the LWRP.</p> <p>With the exception of Condition (3), the conditions and matters of discretion attached to this rule are considered appropriate. Condition (1) requires CVGO activities, under this rule, to prepare and implement a FEP which is consistent with the requirement outlined in the CVGO policy (Policy 4.36A – Sub. Ref. A05). It is understood that Condition (2) accommodates the nature of CVGO operations in the region undertaken by any individual operator (i.e., they can move around different properties and/or within different properties seasonally or annually etc), while placing an appropriate constraint around this flexibility, namely that the area of land over which the operation is to take place does not exceed the ‘baseline commercial growing area’.</p> <p>Condition (3) is considered to be an unnecessary constraint on CVGO activities and should be deleted. As discussed above in relation to Policy 4.36A (Sub. Ref. A05), while acknowledging that it may be easier to assess an application, and therefore administer PPC7 and the LWRP, if a CVGO is located within one nutrient allocation zone of sub-region, this should not be a restriction placed on CVGO operations. It is considered that managing the issues associated with cross-boundary activities, while challenging, is achievable and therefore such activities should not be unduly restricted by an administrative desire for simplicity.</p> <p>Finally, an amendment to Matter of Discretion (6), is</p>	<p>Amend Rule 5.42CB as follows:</p> <p><i>“The discharge of nutrients from a commercial vegetable growing operation that does not meet Rule 5.42CA is a restricted discretionary activity, provided the following conditions are met:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. A Farm Environment Plan has been prepared for the activity in accordance with Part A of Schedule 7 and is submitted with the application for resource consent; and</i> <i>2. The aggregated area of land used for the commercial vegetable growing operation is no greater than the baseline commercial vegetable growing area; and</i> <i>3. All land that forms part of the commercial vegetable growing operation is located within the same sub-region and Nutrient Allocation Zone.</i> <p><i>The exercise of discretion is restricted to the following matters:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. The timing of any actions or good management practices proposed to achieve the objectives and targets described in Schedule 7; and</i> <i>2. Methods to avoid or mitigate adverse effects of the activity on surface and groundwater quality and sources of drinking water; and</i> <i>3. The commencement date for the first audit of the Farm Environment Plan and methods to address any non-compliance identified as result of a Farm Environment Plan audit, including the timing of any subsequent audits; and</i>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				also requested. The proposed amendment refer to nutrient limits only, as not all relevant limits contained in Sections 6 to 15 of the LWRP are nutrient load limits.	<p>4. <i>Methods that demonstrate how any nutrient loss reductions required by Sections 6 to 15 of the Plan will be achieved; and</i></p> <p>5. <i>Reporting of progress made towards any nutrient loss reductions required by Sections 6 to 15 of the Plan, and any actions implemented to remedy issues identified in any audit of the Farm Environment Plan; and</i></p> <p>6. <i>Methods to prevent an exceedance of any relevant nutrient load limits set out in Sections 6 to 15 of the Plan if the region-wide rules continue to apply in the sub-region."</i></p>
A12	Commercial Vegetable Growing Operations - Rule 5.42CC (discretionary activity)	30	Support in part	<p>Discretionary activity status for CVGO activities that are to take place over an aggregated area of land that is greater than the 'baseline commercial vegetable growing area', provided a FEP is in place and the 'lawful nitrogen loss rate' (subject to the appropriate definition of this term – refer to Sub. Ref. A04) is not exceeded, is considered appropriate.</p> <p>However, as the above submission point (Sub. Ref. A11) requests the deletion of Condition 3 of Rule 5.42CB, reference to this condition within this rule is no longer applicable.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 5.422C as follows:</p> <p><i>"The discharge of nutrients from a commercial vegetable growing operation that does not comply with condition 2 or 3 of Rule 5.42CB is a discretionary activity provided the following conditions are met:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. A Farm Environment Plan has been prepared for the activity in accordance with Part A of Schedule 7 and is submitted with the application for resource consent; and</i> <i>2. The nitrogen loss rate from the new or expanded commercial vegetable growing operation does not exceed the lawful nitrogen loss rate applicable to the proposed location."</i>
A13	Commercial Vegetable Growing Operations - Rule 5.42CD (non-complying activity)	30	Support	This CVGO, in terms of a rule hierarchy and the application of non-complying activity status, is similar to that applied to farming activities throughout the region where the activity does not comply with specific conditions of specific rules. This includes non-complying activity status where a FEP has not been	Retain Rule 5.42CD as notified.

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				prepared and provided as part of a resource consent process. For this reason, the proposed non-complying activity rule for such CVGO activities is considered appropriate.	
A14	Commercial Vegetable Growing Operations - Rule 5.42CE (prohibited activity)	31	Support	<p>This CVGO rule is similar to other LWRP rules prohibiting farming activities where the nitrogen loss exceeds a relevant nitrogen baseline.</p> <p>As this is the approach adopted within the LWRP in relation to nutrient management, for the purposes of consistency, the proposed prohibited activity status under this rule is appropriate.</p> <p>While saying this, given the ongoing issues with the Farm Portal (as outlined in paragraphs 2.6 to 2.11 of this submission), Ravensdown considers that it is important that the alternative consent pathway provided for within the LWRP is retained. Otherwise, given the Farm Portal issues, if this rule was to be relied upon without the alternative consent pathway, some farming activities would be prohibited under this rule.</p>	Retain Rule 5.42CE as notified.
A15	Incidental Nutrient Discharges – Rule 5.63 (permitted activity)	32	Support	PPC7 introduces a suite of new nutrient related rules. Therefore, Rule 5.63 has been amended to correctly refer to the range of nutrient related rules that are relevant to this rule. This clarification is required for PPC7 and the LWRP to work effectively.	Retain the amendment to Rule 5.63 as notified.
A16	Incidental Nutrient Discharges – Rule 5.64 (non-complying activity)	32	Support	This rule has been amended by removing an incorrect reference to Rule 5.62 which refers to irrigation schemes or principle water supplier. This clarification is required for LWRP to work effectively.	Retain the amendment to Rule 5.64 as notified.
A17	Fertiliser use – Rule 5.67A (non-complying activity)	32	Support	PPC7 introduces new Rule 5.67A which applies a non-complying activity status to fertiliser use that does not meet the conditions of Rule 5.67. Rule 5.67	Retain Rule 5.67A, including the rule's non-complying activity status, as notified.

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				<p>provides for this activity, as restricted discretionary activities, provided this activity is the subject of a FEP prepared in accordance with Schedule 7A.</p> <p>The PPC7 amendment appropriately addresses a gap in the operative LWRP where the activity status of fertiliser use, where it is not provided for by Rules 5.65 to 5.67, is clarified. Non-complying activity status is considered appropriate in this instance.</p>	
Section 11 – Selwyn – Te Waihora					
A18	Section 11.5.5 – Nutrient Management, Sediment and Microbial Contaminants - Notes	104	Support	<p>The notes to the sub-regional rules on nutrient management, sediment and microbial contaminants clarifies that commercial vegetable growing operations are regulated by region-wide rules (Rules 5.42CA to 5.42CE), rather than any sub-regional rules. This clarification is required for PPC7 and the LWRP to work effectively.</p>	Retain the amended ‘Nutrient Management, Sediment and Microbial Contaminants’ notes contained in Section 11.5.5 of the LWRP as notified.
Section 13 – Ashburton					
A19	Section 13.5 – Rules - Nutrient Management, Sediment and Microbial Contaminants - Notes	114	Support	<p>The notes to the sub-regional rules on nutrient management, sediment and microbial contaminants clarifies that commercial vegetable growing operations are regulated by region-wide rules (Rules 5.42CA to 5.42CE), rather than any sub-regional rules. This clarification is required for PPC7 and the LWRP to work effectively.</p>	Retain the amended ‘Nutrient Management, Sediment and Microbial Contaminants’ notes contained in Section 13.5 of the LWRP as notified.
Section 15A – South Coastal Canterbury					
A20	Section 15A.5 – Rules - Nutrient Management, Sediment and Microbial Contaminants -	179	Support	<p>The notes to the sub-regional rules on nutrient management, sediment and microbial contaminants clarifies that commercial vegetable growing operations are regulated by region-wide rules (Rules 5.42CA to 5.42CE), rather than any sub-regional rules. This clarification is required for PPC7 and the LWRP to</p>	Retain the amended ‘Nutrient Management, Sediment and Microbial Contaminants’ notes contained in Section 15A.5 of the LWRP as notified.

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
	Notes			work effectively.	
Section 15B - Waitaki					
A21	Section 15B.5 – Rules - Nutrient Management - Note	181	Support	Although not shown in tracked changes in PPC7, a new note to the sub-regional rules for nutrient management clarifies that commercial vegetable growing operations are regulated by region-wide rules (Rules 5.42CA to 5.42CE), rather than any sub-regional rules. This clarification is required for PPC7 and the LWRP to work effectively.	Retain the new 'Nutrient Management' note contained in Section 15B.5 of the LWRP as notified.
Section 16 - Schedules					
A22	Schedule 7 – Farm Environment Plans – Part B	189 and 190	Support	PPC7 inserts references to 'commercial vegetable growing operations' into the relevant provisions of Schedule 7. Commercial vegetable growing operations should be required to prepared and implemented FEPs consistent with the approach required for other farming activities in the region. The establishment of a policy and regulatory framework for commercial vegetable growing outcomes that includes use of FEPs is considered an appropriate means of improving the freshwater outcomes for the region.	Retain the amendments to Schedule 7 of the LWRP, namely in the inclusion of references 'commercial vegetable growing operations' within the schedule, as notified.
A23	Schedule 7 – Farm Environment Plans – Part B Clause 10 – Waimakariri – Additional Requirements	194	Support in part	Ravensdown support the development and use of FEP (and the implementation of GMP), as incorporated into the LWRP, as a means of identifying and managing the actual and potential effects on the environment of farming activities. In this context, as the Waimakariri Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (Waimakariri ZIPA), December 2018, made a number of recommendations aimed at reducing nitrates (Rec. D3.3.1 to D3.3.9) in the Waimakariri sub-region, the	Amend Part B, Clause 10 of Schedule 7, as follows: <i>“Within the Waimakariri Sub-region, the following additional requirements of farm environment plans apply:</i> <i>1. The information required under Part B 2(c) includes the location of any artificial watercourses</i> <i>2. Management Area 5A:Nutrients includes the following additional objectives and targets:</i>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				<p>reflection of these additional approaches within the FEPs developed in the sub-region is appropriate.</p> <p>The Waimakariri ZIPA recommendations included: implementing a staged approach to reduce nitrate losses over time (Rec. D3.3.1); establishing the now proposed Nitrate Priority Area (NPA) (Rec. D3.3.2); using Baseline GMP as the starting point for nitrate reductions from 1 July 2020 within the sub-region (Rec. D3.3.4); by 2030 in the NPA, dairying should reduce nitrates by 15% beyond Baseline GMP and all other consented farming activities are to achieve a reduction of 5% beyond Baseline GMP (Rec. D3.3.3 and D3.3.6); and, the nitrate loss rate reductions of 5% and 15% are to be repeated until the water quality limits are met or are likely to be met without further reductions (Rec. D3.3.9).</p> <p>As outlined in a submission on the draft Waimakariri ZIPA, Ravensdown support the establishment of the NPA and the recommendation to reduce nitrate losses beyond Baseline GMP within the NPA. The submission on the draft Waimakariri ZIPA also identifies that nitrogen loss reductions pose significant challenges for many farmers, have potential impacts on business viability and need to be scientifically based having considered the economic and practical implications. On this basis, the arbitrary continued percentage reductions was opposed by Ravensdown in its submission on the draft Waimakariri ZIPA.</p> <p>Given the concerns outlined above, and as outlined in paragraphs 2.28 to 2.30 of this submission, Ravensdown does not support the continued staged reductions outlined in Table 8-9 of PPC7 (Sub. Ref.</p>	<p>Objectives:</p> <p>1. Staged <u>Reductions, staged over time, in nitrogen loss for land within the Nitrate Priority Area to meet nitrate-nitrogen limits for surface water, groundwater and drinking water sources in Section 8.</u></p> <p>Targets:</p> <p>1. <u>Where required, by 1 January 2030 or later date in accordance with Policy 8.4.27, further reductions in the nitrogen loss rate for properties within the Nitrate Priority Area to achieve the nitrate-nitrogen and total nitrogen targets specified in Tables 8-5, 8-6 and 8-8 and for nitrogen losses from dairy farming activities to be reduced by 15% and from all other farming activities by 5%. as required by Table 8-9.</u></p> <p>2. <u>Within the Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka) and Coastal Protection Zone, any property greater than 5 ha in area that includes or directly adjoins a river or coastal lake, and with winter grazing or irrigation on the property, is to prepare, implement, and have audited a Farm Environment Plan in accordance with this Schedule. However, Management Area 5A: Nutrients, Objective 2, Target 1 does not apply to properties that comply with the irrigation and winter grazing thresholds in Rule 8.5.25"</u></p>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				<p>A97) and therefore the proposed specific FEP requirements for the Waimakariri sub-region have been amended by ensuring that the focus is on achieving the freshwater outcomes being sought (i.e., achieving the water quality targets) rather than focussing on the continued staged percentage reductions outlined in Table 8-9.</p> <p>However, as outlined above in paragraphs 2.28 to 2.30 of this submission, Ravensdown does support the requirement to reduce nitrogen losses from dairy farming activities by 15%, by 2030, and 5% from all other farming activities. The FEP requirements for the NPA has been amended to reflect this requirement.</p>	
A24	<p>Schedule 7 – Farm Environment Plans – Part B</p> <p>Clause 11 – Orari-Temuka-Opihi-Pareora – Additional Requirements – Management Area 5A: Nutrients (Clause 11(2))</p>	194 to 196	Support in part	<p>As outlined above (Sub. Ref. A23), Ravensdown supports the development and use of FEPs (and the implementation of GMP), as incorporated into the LWRP, as a means of identifying and managing the actual and potential effects on the environment of farming activities.</p> <p>In this context, as the Orari-Temuka-Opihi-Pareora (OTOP) Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (OTOP ZIPA), December 2018, made a number of recommendations aimed at reducing nitrates in identified hotspot areas (Rec. 4.8.1(II)(b) and (III)(b) and 4.8.2(I)), the reflection of these additional approaches within the FEPs developed in the sub-region is appropriate.</p> <p>Ravensdown supports the need for farming activities to reduce diffuse nitrogen losses, in the high nitrogen concentration areas (HNCA) in accordance with GMP and by 15% for dairy farming activities and 5% for other farming activities by 2030. However,</p>	<p>Amend Part B, Clause 11 of Schedule 7, as follows:</p> <p><i>“Within the Orari-Temuka-Opihi-Pareora Sub-region, Part B of Schedule 7 also includes the following:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The information required under Part B 2(c) includes the location of any artificial watercourses.</i> Management Area 5A: Nutrients includes the following additional objective and targets: <p>Objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Staged <u>Reductions, staged over time, beyond Baseline GMP Loss Rates, or lawful nitrogen loss rates,</u> within the Rangitata Orton, Fairlie Basin, and Levels Plains High Nitrogen Concentration Areas to meet nitrate-nitrogen limits for surface and groundwater within Section 14. <p>Targets:</p>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				<p>Ravensdown does acknowledge that these reductions may be challenging for some farmers, and may have the potential to erode land values and affect some farmers' ability to remain in business.</p> <p>Given the concerns outlined above, and as outlined in paragraphs 2.19 to 2.21 of this submission, Ravensdown does not support the continued staged percentage reductions outlined in Table 14(zc) (Sub. Ref. A58) and therefore the proposed specific FEP requirements for the OTOP sub-region have been amended by ensuring that the focus is on achieving the freshwater outcomes being sought (i.e., achieving the water quality targets and the farm type specific nitrogen loss percentage reductions up to 2030) rather than focussing on the percentage reductions outlined in Table 14(zc).</p>	<p>1. <i>Where required, by 1 January 2030, <u>or later date in accordance with Policy 8.4.27</u>, further reductions in nitrogen losses beyond Baseline GMP Loss Rates, or lawful nitrogen loss rates for properties within the Rangitata Orton, Fairlie Basin and Levels Plains High Nitrogen Concentration Zones Areas to achieve the nitrate-nitrogen, total nitrogen and ammoniacal nitrogen targets specified in Tables 14(d), 14(f) and 14(g) and for nitrogen losses from dairy farming activities to be reduced by 15% and from all other farming activities by 5% as required by Table 14(zc). However, Management Area 5A: Nutrients, Objective 2, Target 1 does not apply to properties that comply with the irrigation and winter grazing thresholds in Rule 14.5.17."</i></p>
A25	Schedule 7A – Management Plan for Farming Activities – Additional Requirements	197 to 199	Support	<p>The LWRP permits a number of farming activities, or farming related activities, subject to conditions, including the requirement that the activity is subject to a Management Plan prepared in accordance with Schedule 7A.</p> <p>The specification of additional Management Plan requirements for these sub-regions is considered appropriate. The additional requirements include the location of artificial watercourses and in the OTOP sub-region the identification of practices to protect mahika kai values by protecting or enhancing water quality and stream health. These additional requirements reflects the freshwater outcomes being sought within these sub-regions.</p>	Retain the amendments to Schedule 7A as notified.

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 7B (ORARI-TEMUKA-OPIHI-PAREORA SUB-REGION) (Section 14 of the LWRP)					
A26	High Nitrogen Concentration Area	124	Support in part	<p>It is acknowledged that the Rangitata Orton, Fairlie Basin and Levels Plain areas are characterised by elevated nitrate levels. Therefore, the identification of water quality targets and an associated planning framework to reduce nitrate in these HNCA, in order to achieve these targets, is consistent with the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM).</p> <p>While this statement of fact in relation to the HNCA is supported, amendments to this description are required to reflect Ravensdown's submissions (Sub. Ref. A58) requesting the deletion of the proposed percentage reductions contained in Table 14(zc) of PPC7B.</p>	<p>Amend the description of High Nitrogen Concentration Areas as follows:</p> <p><i>"The Orari, Opihi and Timaru Freshwater Management Units contain the High Nitrogen Concentration Areas of Rangitata Orton, Fairlie Basin and Levels Plain. Within these areas, nitrate-nitrogen concentrations in groundwater and surface water exceed recommended guidelines in the New Zealand Drinking Water Standards 2005 (revised 2008), and national bottom lines for ecosystem health in the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. Water quality targets have been established in these areas alongside an <u>two</u> or <u>three</u> tiered approach of for nitrate reductions."</i></p>
A27	Orari-Temuka-Opihi-Pareora Zone Committee	124 and 125	Support	<p>This section contains an accurate overview of the OTOP ZIPA recommendations.</p> <p>As this overview establishes the basis for the development of PPC7B's provisions, the inclusion of this overview within the OTOP sub-regional provisions of the LWRP is considered appropriate.</p>	Retain the description of Orari-Temuka-Opihi-Pareora Zone Committee recommendations as notified.
A28	Section 14.1A - Orari-Temuka-Opihi-Pareora Definitions	125 to 128	Oppose in part	PPC7B introduces a range of OTOP sub-region specific terminology that is not used elsewhere in the LWRP. For ease of use of the LWRP as a whole, it would be of assistance to users of the LWRP if similar terminology to that used elsewhere in the region could also be utilised in this section of the LWRP.	Consideration is given to changing or amending definitions to ensure more alignment with terminology used throughout the LWRP.
A29	Section 14.1 – Other Regional Plans and Instruments that	128 and 129	Support	Amendments to this section of the OTOP sub-regional provisions deletes references to the Opihi River Regional Plan and Pareora Catchment Environmental Flow and Water Allocation Regional Plan as these	Retain the amendments to this section of the LWRP as notified.

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
	apply to the Orari-Temuka-Opihi-Pareora Sub-region			plans will be rescinded once PPC7 is operative. This deletion clearly identifies that sub-regional provisions of the LWRP will regulate activities in these catchments rather than these regional plans. The clarity and consistency provided to resource users by these amendments is appropriate.	
A30	Section 14.4 – Policies – Freshwater Management Units – Policy 14.4.1	130	Support in part	The establishment of the proposed six freshwater management units (FMU), and associated water quality and quantity limits and targets, appropriately reflects the requirements of the National Objectives Framework of the NPS-FM. However, for the purpose of clarity, it is considered that the policy should be amended to reflect the fact that where limits are being achieved, water quality (or quantity) maintenance, not improvement, is a valid resource management response.	Amend Policy 14.4.1 as follows: <i>“Management of freshwater in the Orari-Temuka-Opihi-Pareora sub-region is achieved through the establishment of six Freshwater Management Units, and <u>the maintenance or improvements in freshwater quality and quantity is attained through the setting of, and managing to, water quality and quantity</u> limits and targets for each area.”</i>
A31	Section 14.4 – Policies – Livestock Exclusion from Waterbodies – Policy 14.4.15	134 and 135	Support in part	The OTOP ZIPA contains recommendations in relation to the pathways for achieving water quality outcomes. Two of these recommendations entail, for the purposes of stock exclusion as addressed in the LWRP, the identification that in the OTOP sub-region rivers include springheads and drains and artificial watercourses that discharge into surface waterbodies (Rec. 4.8.2(VI) and (VII)). While the intent of the policy is supported by Ravensdown, it is considered that there is the potential for on-ground implementation challenges for the farming community arising out of this policy.	While recognising that there may be implementation challenges for farmers in relation to the intent of this policy, retain Policy 14.4.15 as notified.
A32	Section 14.4 – Policies – Livestock Exclusion from Waterbodies –	135	Support in part	In addition to the OTOP sub-regional stock exclusion provisions identified in Policy 14.4.15 above (Sub. Ref. A31), this proposed policy identifies that stock exclusion from springs, rivers and lakes and the beds	While recognising that there may be implementation challenges for farmers in relation to the intent of this policy, retain Policy 14.4.16 as notified.

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
	Policy 14.4.16			<p>and banks of water bodies in the Mātaitai Protection Zone (associated with the lower reaches of the Opihi River, its lagoons and tributaries) is required to protect papatipu rūnanga values and to reduce diffuse discharges to surface water. This policy is consistent with Rec. 4.8.2(VII) of the OTOP ZIPA.</p> <p>As outlined above (Sub. Ref. A32), while the intent of the policy is supported, it is considered that there is the potential for on-ground implementation challenges for the farming community arising out of this policy.</p>	
A33	Section 14.4 – Policies – Nutrient Management – Policy 14.4.17	135	Support	<p>This policy outlines the resource management approach for farming activities in the OTOP sub-region in order to achieve the sub-region's water quality outcomes, limits and targets. The approach entails: permitting smaller farms (<10ha) subject to preparing and implementing a Management Plan; requiring the preparation and implementation of a FEP and GMP for farming activities where a resource consent is required; requiring farming activities with the potential for higher nitrogen losses to not exceed the Baseline GMP Loss Rate; requiring farming activities in the High Runoff Risk Phosphorus and Mātaitai Protection Zones, depending on the nature of irrigation and/or winter grazing, to demonstrate in FEPs how the loss of contaminants to water will be actively managed; and, requiring farming activities that irrigate in the Rock Art Management Area to demonstrate how adverse effects on tuhituhi neherā (rock art) will be minimised.</p> <p>The proposed resource management approach for farming activities is consistent with the recommendations of the OTOP ZIPA.</p>	Retain Policy 14.4.17 as notified.

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				In addition, Ravensdown supports: permitting small-scale farming activities subject to the implementation of a Management Plan under Schedule 7A of the LWRP; and, providing for other farming activities by way of resource consent whereby the management of the potential adverse effects is managed under an FEP and the implementation of GMP, including in relation to any specific values or targets associated with any areas within the sub-region.	
A34	Section 14.4 – Policies – Nutrient Management – Policy 14.4.18	135 and 136	Support in part	<p>As noted above (Sub. Ref. A26), it is acknowledged that the Rangitata Orton, Fairlie Basin and Levels Plain areas are characterised by elevated nitrate levels. Therefore, the clear identification of these HNCA and the associated requirement for nitrogen loss reductions, including by farming activities, to achieve water quality targets is appropriate.</p> <p>However, the aim of any nitrogen loss reductions should be to achieve, on a cumulative basis, the relevant water quality targets, not the continued percentage reductions specified in Table 14(zc).</p> <p>In this regard, it is noted that Ravensdown is requesting the deletion of Table 14(zc), and all consequential amendments throughout PPC7 (Sub. Ref. A58).</p>	<p>Amend Policy 14.4.18 as follows:</p> <p><i>“Water quality is improved in the Orari, Opihi and Timaru Freshwater Management Units by:</i></p> <p><i>a. defining the Rangitata Orton High Nitrogen Concentration Area, Fairlie Basin High Nitrogen Concentration Area and Levels Plain High Nitrogen Concentration Area within which targeted reductions of nitrogen loss reductions are required to achieve the nitrate-nitrogen, total nitrogen and ammoniacal nitrogen targets specified in Tables 14(d), 14(f) and 14(g); in accordance with Table 14(zc) are required; and</i></p> <p><i>b. avoiding the grant of any resource consent that will result in the nitrogen loss calculation from a farming activity exceeding the Baseline GMP Loss Rate, except where Policy 14.4.20 applies.”</i></p>
A35	Section 14.4 – Policies – Nutrient Management – Policy 14.4.19	136	Oppose	As noted above in relation to proposed Policy 14.4.18 (Sub. Ref. A34), the aim of any nitrogen loss reductions from farming activities that require resource consents should be to achieve, on a cumulative basis, the relevant water quality targets, not the continued staged percentage reductions	<p>Amend Policy 14.4.19 as follows:</p> <p><i>“Water quality targets in the Rangitata Orton High Nitrogen Concentration Area, Fairlie Basin High Nitrogen Concentration Area and Levels Plain High Nitrogen Concentration Area are</i></p>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				<p>specified in Table 14(zc). In addition, Ravensdown is also requesting the deletion of Table 14(zc). and all consequential amendments throughout PPC7 (Sub. Ref. A58). On this basis, the policy should be amended to refer to reductions in nitrogen losses in order to achieve the relevant water quality targets, as well as the nitrogen loss reductions considered achievable by Ravensdown, by 2030, of 15% from dairy farming activities and 5% for other farming activities.</p> <p>In relation to part (b) of this policy, while water quality outcomes are not being achieved in HNCAs, Ravensdown considers that a 10-year consent term is generally appropriate for farming activities within the HNCAs. However, to provide Council with a degree of flexibility in terms of being able to align consent terms to a consistent timeframe within HNCAs, or the sub-region as a whole, it is considered that this part of the policy should refer to 'generally' no more than ten years. It is also noted, that consent terms of less than 10-years are not considered appropriate, particularly as it may restrict a farmer's ability to commit to investing in its property.</p> <p>In relation to the proposed limited consent term, it is noted that there may be resourcing issues when resource consents are initially sought and at the time of consent renewal, as was the case when Plan Change 5 (PC5) to the LWRP became operative. Given this potential issue, Ravensdown requests that Council continue to operate a queuing system so as to ensure that farmers are not penalised for non-compliance when it is not their fault that relevant professionals and/or technical experts are not</p>	<p><i>achieved by:</i></p> <p><i>a. all resource consents granted for farming activities that require the preparation of a nutrient budget being subject to consent conditions requiring further reductions in nitrogen loss <u>to contribute to the achievement of the nitrate-nitrogen, total nitrogen and ammoniacal nitrogen targets specified in Tables 14(d), 14(f) and 14(q) and, by 2030, for nitrogen losses from dairy farming activities to be reduced by 15% and from all other farming activities by 5% beyond Baseline GMP Loss Rates, or consented nitrogen loss rates, in accordance with Table 14(zc); and</u></i></p> <p><i>b. limiting the duration of any resource consent for a farming activity that is required to make further reductions in nitrogen loss (beyond Baseline GMP Loss Rates or consented nitrogen loss rates) in accordance with Table 14(zc), to generally no more than ten years and only imposing one reduction beyond Baseline GMP Loss Rates or consented nitrogen loss rates per consent term; and</i></p> <p><i>c. avoiding the grant of any resource consent that will result in a farming activity not reducing nitrogen losses beyond Baseline GMP Loss Rates or consented nitrogen loss rates.</i></p>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				<p>available to carry out all the work at the same time.</p> <p>It is also considered that part (c) of this policy is not required, as other PPC7 policy provisions including Policy 14.4.18(b), establish an appropriate bottom line in relation to avoiding, or prohibiting, the granting of resource consents for farming activities.</p>	
A36	Section 14.4 – Policies – Nutrient Management – Policy 14.4.20	136	Support in part	<p>There are two key considerations associated with this policy.</p> <p>Firstly, the policy recognises that for some of the farming activities in the OTOP sub-region, the farm may not be able to meet the calculated Baseline GMP Loss Rate generated by the Farm Portal. It is appropriate to provide for the consenting of these activities in accordance with parts (a) and (b) of this policy, as it would be inappropriate to prohibit continued (and unchanged) farming based on a theoretical Farm Portal calculation.</p> <p>In relation to part (c) and as stated in earlier submission points, the aim of any nitrogen loss reductions from farming activities within the HNCA (that require resource consents) should be to achieve, on a cumulative basis, the relevant water quality targets, not the continued staged percentage reductions specified in Table 14(zc). However, as also stated in earlier submission points, Ravensdown also considers that nitrogen loss reductions, by 2030, of 15% from dairy farming activities and 5% for other farming activities are achievable and thus should be applied within the sub-region.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 14.4.20 as follows:</p> <p><i>“In the Orari-Temuka-Opihi-Pareora sub-region, only consider granting an application for a land use consent for a farming activity to exceed the Baseline GMP Loss Rate where:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>the Baseline GMP Loss Rate has been lawfully exceeded prior to 20 July 2019 and the application for resource consent contains evidence that directly and specifically establishes that the exceedance was lawful; and</i> <i>the nitrogen loss calculation remains below the lesser of either the Good Management Practice Loss Rate or the nitrogen loss calculation that occurred in the four years prior to 20 July 2019; and</i> <i>for properties within the Rangitata Orton High Nitrogen Concentration Area, Fairlie Basin High Nitrogen Concentration Area and Levels Plain High Nitrogen Concentration Area, the applicant commits to <u>reducing nitrogen losses to contribute to the achievement of the nitrate-nitrogen, total nitrogen and ammoniacal nitrogen targets specified in Tables 14(d), 14(f) and 14(g) and, by 2030, for nitrogen losses from dairy farming activities to be reduced by 15% and from all other farming</u></i>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
					activities by 5% – achieving the percentage-based nitrogen loss reductions in Table 14(zc)."
A37	Section 14.4 – Policies – Nutrient Management – Policy 14.4.20A	136	Support in part	<p>This policy accommodates the fact that it may not be possible for some farming activities to reduce nitrogen losses, within HNCAs, in accordance with the specific reductions identified in the OTOP ZIPA and thus accommodated within the notified PPC7B. Given this recognition, the policy outlines in parts (a) to (e) the matters to be considered when processing farming activity applications in HNCAs where the requirements of Policy 14.4.20(c) are not being met. The matters include: consideration of reductions already achieved; proposed mitigations that are better than GMP; the costs of achieving reductions in relation to farming viability and the benefit or spreading investment over time; the nature of steps proposed; and, progress to achieving the relevant nitrate-nitrogen limits and targets.</p> <p>Ravensdown considers that matters listed are appropriate, in that reductions are encouraged while ensuring that farming activities remain financially viable. The policy also appropriately focusses on achieving water quality limits and targets, not continued staged percentage reductions, which is consistent with Ravensdown's submission in relation the requested deletion of Table 14(zc) (Sub. Ref. A58) and all related provisions.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 14.4.20A as follows:</p> <p><i>"Where an application for a land use consent for a farming activity demonstrates the nitrogen loss rate reductions required by Policy 14.4.20(c) are unable may not be able to be achieved by the dates specified in Table 14(zc), any application for an extension of time to achieve those reductions will be considered having regard to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. the Baseline GMP Loss Rate and the level of any enduring nitrogen loss rate reduction already achieved; and</i> <i>b. the nature and extent of any mitigations implemented during the nitrogen baseline period that are better than Good Management Practice, and the extent to which these have been effective in minimising nitrogen losses; and</i> <i>c. the capital and operational costs of achieving the nitrogen loss rate reductions and the benefit (in terms of maintaining a farming activity's financial viability) of spreading that investment over time; and</i> <i>d. the nature, sequencing, measurability, effectiveness and enforceability of any steps proposed to achieve the nitrogen loss rate reductions; and</i> <i>e. progress made towards achieving nitrate-nitrogen limits and targets in Tables 14(a) to 14(g)."</i>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
A38	Section 14.4 – Policies – Nutrient Management – Policy 14.4.20B	137	Support	This policy appropriately recognises that for many farming activities and/or in some locations, the Farm Portal cannot generate an accurate Baseline GMP Loss Rate or Good Management Practice Loss Rate. Given this issue, the provision of an alternative consent pathway, which this policy provides for, is appropriate.	Retain Policy 14.4.20B as notified.
A39	Section 14.4 – Policies – Nutrient Management – Policy 14.4.20C	137	Support	<p>This policy is connected to the alternative consent pathway policy (Policy 14.4.20B – refer to Sub. Ref. A38 above), provided for within PPC7, where the Farm Portal cannot generate an accurate Baseline GMP Loss Rate or Good Management Practice Loss Rate.</p> <p>This policy specifies that a review condition is to be attached to resource consents granted under the alternative consent pathway. The review condition is to be linked to when the Farm Portal can generate the relevant loss rates. The use of such a review clause is appropriate as it will ensure that farming activities in the sub-region are all operating in accordance with consistent obligations.</p>	Retain Policy 14.4.20C as notified.
A40	Section 14.4 – Policies – Levels Plain High Nitrogen Concentration Area – Policy 14.4.41	141 and 142	Support in part	<p>This policy arises out of Rec. 3.4(II) of the OTOP ZIPA. This recommendation identifies that to achieve the water quality targets in the Levels Plain HNCA, industrial activities are to reduce nitrogen discharges by up to 30% by 2035. The Committee made this recommendation as means of ensuring that the burden of reducing nitrogen losses is shared between landowners and industry.</p> <p>This policy will apply to Ravensdown's Seadown store. The store holds a resource consent to discharge stormwater to land. Given the nature of the site's operations, there is the potential for nitrogen to</p>	<p>Amend Policy 14.4.41 as follows:</p> <p><i>“Assist in achieving water quality targets for the Levels Plain High Nitrogen Concentration Area by requiring, in addition to Policy 14.4.19, point source discharges of nitrogen from industrial or trade waste disposal activities <u>are to aim to</u> reduce nitrogen losses by <u>up to 30% below current</u> consented rates by 1 January 2035.”</i></p>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				<p>become entrained within the stormwater and for this reason a nitrogen limit is included in the resource consent conditions.</p> <p>While Ravensdown accepts that it is reasonable for industrial activities to share the burden in achieving the HNCA water quality targets, for some industries achieving a 30% reduction below current consented levels, by 2035, may be challenging. For this reason, amendments to the policy are proposed to ensure that the policy identifies that the aim is to achieved reductions 'up to' 30%, rather than an absolute 30%. This approach is consistent with the OTOP ZIPA recommendation.</p>	
A41	Section 14.5 – Rules – Individual Farming Activities – Rule 14.5.14 (permitted activity)	149	Support	Proposed new permitted activity Rule 14.5.14 permits all farming activities on a property of 10ha or less within the OTOP sub-region. There are no conditions attached to this rule. This is the equivalent threshold used to permit farming activities in the region-wide provisions of the LWRP. For this reason, the application of a similar rule with a similar threshold in the OTOP sub-region is appropriate.	Retain Rule 14.5.14, including the rule's permitted activity status, as notified.
A42	Section 14.5 – Rules – Individual Farming Activities – Rule 14.5.15	149	Support in part	<p>The clarifying note, or rather rule, subject to one amendment, clarifies that any different requirements for farming activities in relation to nitrogen loss reductions in HNCAs only relates to the part of the farm located within the HNCA. This is logical and thus appropriate.</p> <p>The one amendment arises out of Ravensdown's submission point/s which requests the deletion of Table 14(zc) (Sub. Ref. A58) and associated staged percentage reductions in nitrogen losses.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 14.5.15 as follows:</p> <p><i>“Where any property or farming enterprise includes land within the High Nitrogen Concentration Area, the nitrogen loss reductions in Table 14(zc) requirements only apply to that part of the property within the High Nitrogen Concentration Area”</i></p>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
A43	Section 14.5 – Rules – Individual Farming Activities – Rule 14.5.16 (discretionary activity)	149	Support	This rule, and subsequent Rules 14.5.16A and 14.5.16B (Sub. Refs. A44 and A45), reflect the alternative consent pathway provided for under Policy 14.4.20C (Sub. Ref. A39). These rules are also consistent with the region-wide alternative consent pathway provided for by Rules 5.42A to 5.42C. For these reasons, this rule is appropriate as proposed.	Retain Rule 14.5.16, including the rule’s discretionary activity status, as notified.
A44	Section 14.5 – Rules – Individual Farming Activities – Rule 14.5.16A (non-complying activity)	149	Support	This rule, as well as Rules 14.5.16 and 14.5.16B (Sub. Refs. A43 and A45), reflect the alternative consent pathway provided for under Policy 14.4.20C (Sub. Ref. A39). These rules are also consistent with the region-wide alternative consent pathway provided for by Rules 5.42A to 5.42C. For these reasons, this rule is appropriate as proposed.	Retain 14.5.16A, including the rule’s non-complying activity status, as notified.
A45	Section 14.5 – Rules – Individual Farming Activities – Rule 14.5.16B (prohibited activity)	150	Support	This rule, as well as Rules 14.5.16 and 14.5.16A (Sub. Refs. A43 and A44), reflect the alternative consent pathway provided for under Policy 14.4.20C (Sub. Ref. A39). These rules are also consistent with the region-wide alternative consent pathway rules provided for by Rules 5.42A to 5.42C, including prohibited activity status under Rule 5.42C. For these reasons, this rule is appropriate as proposed.	Retain 14.5.16B, including the rule’s prohibited activity status, as notified.
A46	Section 14.5 – Rules – Individual Farming Activities – Rule 14.5.17 (permitted activity)	150	Support in part	This OTOP sub-regional rule is similar to a region-wide rule for farming activities in the Red Nutrient Allocation Zone which permits farming activities which have lesser effects on nutrient losses than other farming activities (Rule 5.44). For this reason, the proposed permitted activity rule is considered appropriate. However, additional conditions (Conditions 5 to 7), restrict some specific farming related activities within the Rock Art Management Area, the Mātaitai	Amend Rule 14.5.17 as follows: <i>“The use of land for a farming activity on a property greater than 10 hectares in area is a permitted activity provided the following conditions are met:</i> <i>1. The property is registered in the Farm Portal by 20 July 2022 and information about the farming activity and the property is reviewed and updated by the property owner or their agent, every 36 months thereafter or</i>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				<p>Protection Zone and the High Runoff Risk Phosphorus Zone. Given the specific issues in the sub-region which Condition 5 to 7 are aiming to address, these conditions are also considered appropriate.</p> <p>This rule also places restrictions on the extent of irrigation (Condition 3). This condition is generally consistent with Conditions 2 and 3 of Rule 5.44, although it has been restructured. However, to ensure consistency between Condition 2 and 3 of Rule 5.44 and Condition 3 of this rule, the reference to no more than 50 hectares needs to be amended to refer to the area authorised to be irrigated.</p>	<p><i>whenever a material change in the land use associated with the farming activity occurs, or whenever any boundary of the property is changed; and</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>2. A Management Plan in accordance with Schedule 7A has been prepared and is implemented, and is supplied to the Canterbury Regional Council on request; and</i> <i>3. Any increase in the area of the property that is irrigated is limited to 10 hectares above that which was irrigated at 20 July 2019, provided that no more than 50 hectares is <u>authorised to be</u> irrigated in total; and</i> <i>4. The area of the property used for winter grazing of cattle is less than or equal to:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. 10 hectares for any property less than 100 hectares in area; or</i> <i>b. 10% of the area of the property, for any property between 100 and 1000 hectares in area; or</i> <i>c. 100 hectares, for any property greater than 1000 hectares in area; and</i> <i>5. For any property that has part of the property located within the Rock Art Management Area, there is no irrigation on the part of the property within the management area; and</i> <i>6. For any property that has part of the property located within the Mātaitai Protection Zone and that includes or directly adjoins any river or coastal lake, there is no irrigation or winter grazing on any part of the property within the protection zone; and</i>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
					7. For any property greater than 20 hectares in area that has part of the property located within the High Runoff Risk Phosphorus Zone, the area used for winter grazing of cattle or deer does not exceed 20 hectares.”
A47	Section 14.5 – Rules – Individual Farming Activities – Rule 14.5.18 (controlled activity)	150 and 151	Support in part	<p>This rule provides for farming activities within the Rock Art Management Area, the Mātaitai Protection Zone and the High Runoff Risk Phosphorus Zone in the OTOP sub-region, that do not comply with Conditions 5 to 7 of Rule 14.5.17 as a controlled activity. The conditions attached to this controlled activity rule (subject to one amendment), and the matters of over which control are reserved are generally consistent, except for the necessary sub-region specific information, with the approach provided for in the relevant region-wide controlled activity rules.</p> <p>However, as addressed above in relation to Rule 14.5.17 (Sub. Ref. A46), Condition 2 of this rule needs to be amended to refer to the maximum area of irrigation authorised to be irrigated.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 14.5.18 as follows:</p> <p><i>“The use of land for a farming activity on a property greater than 10 hectares in area that does not comply with one or more of conditions 5, 6 or 7 of Rule 14.5.17 is a controlled activity, provided the following conditions are met:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. A Farm Environment Plan has been prepared for the property in accordance with Part A of Schedule 7 and is submitted with the application for resource consent; and</i> <i>2. Any increase in the irrigated area of the property is limited to 10 hectares above that which was irrigated at 20 July 2019, provided that no more than 50 hectares is <u>authorised to be</u> irrigated in total; and</i> <i>3. The area of the property used for winter grazing of cattle is less than or equal to:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. 10 hectares for any property less than 100 hectares in area; or</i> <i>b. 10% of the area of the property, for any property between 100 and 1000 hectares in area; or</i> <i>c. 100 hectares, for any property greater than 1000 hectares in area.</i> <p><i>The CRC reserves control over the following matters:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. The content of, compliance with, and auditing</i>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
					<p><i>of the Farm Environment Plan; and</i></p> <p>2. <i>The commencement date for the first audit of the Farm Environment Plan; and</i></p> <p>3. <i>The timing of any actions or good management practices proposed to achieve the objectives and targets described in Schedule 7; and</i></p> <p>4. <i>Methods to avoid or mitigate adverse effects of the activity on surface water quality, groundwater quality and sources of drinking water; and</i></p> <p>5. <i>Methods to avoid or mitigate adverse effects on mahinga kai, wāhi tapu, wāhi taonga, nohoanga, waipuna, freshwater mātaītai or tuhituhi neherā (rock art).</i></p> <p>6. <i>Methods to address any non-compliance identified as a result of a Farm Environment Plan audit, including the timing of subsequent audits"</i></p>
A48	Section 14.5 – Rules – Individual Farming Activities – Rule 14.5.19 (restricted discretionary activity)	151 and 152	Support in part	<p>Restricted discretionary activity status for farming activities in the OTOP region, which are not provided for by Rules 14.5.17 and 14.5.18, is considered appropriate. The conditions attached to this rule, and the associated matters of discretion (except for Matter of Discretion (8)), are considered appropriate and generally consistent with the approach provided for in the region-wide provisions.</p> <p>The amendment of Matter of Discretion (8) arises out of Ravensdown's submission point/s which requests the deletion of Table 14(zc) (Sub. Ref. A58) and thus the associated staged percentage reductions in nitrogen losses. Rather, as requested within Ravensdown's submissions points, the focus of</p>	<p>Amend Rule 14.5.19 as follows:</p> <p><i>"The use of land for a farming activity on a property greater than 10 hectares in area that does not comply with one or more of conditions 1, 2, 3 or 4 of Rule 14.5.17 or one or more of conditions 2 or 3 of Rule 14.5.18 is a restricted discretionary, provided the following conditions are met:</i></p> <p>1. <i>A Farm Environment Plan has been prepared for the property in accordance with Part A of Schedule 7 and is submitted with the application for resource consent; and</i></p> <p>2. <i>Until 30 June 2020, the nitrogen loss</i></p>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				<p>nitrogen loss reductions in HNCAs should be on assisting with the achievement of the water quality targets specified in Tables 14(d), 14(f) and 14(g). However, as also stated in submission points, Ravensdown also considers that nitrogen loss reductions, by 2030, of 15% from dairy farming activities and 5% for other farming activities are achievable and thus should be applied within the sub-region. Matter of Discretion (8) has also been amended to reflect this aim.</p>	<p><i>calculation for the property does not exceed the nitrogen baseline, and from 1 July 2020 the Baseline GMP Loss Rate; unless the nitrogen baseline was lawfully exceeded prior to 20 July 2019, and the application for resource consent demonstrates that the exceedance was lawful.</i></p> <p><i>The exercise of discretion is restricted to the following matters:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. The efficacy of the Farm Environment Plan; and</i> <i>2. The commencement date for the first audit of the Farm Environment Plan; and</i> <i>3. The content, quality and accuracy of the nutrient budgets provided with the application for resource consent; and</i> <i>4. The actual or potential effects on surface water quality, groundwater quality and sources of drinking water; and</i> <i>5. The timing of any actions or good management practices proposed to achieve the objectives and targets described in Schedule 7; and</i> <i>6. Methods to avoid or mitigate adverse effects on sites of any adverse effects on mahinga kai, wāhi tapu, wāhi taonga, waipuna or tuhituhi neherā; and</i> <i>7. Methods that limit the nitrogen loss calculation for the farming activity to a rate not exceeding the Baseline GMP Loss Rate; and</i> <i>8. For properties within a High Nitrogen</i>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
					<p><i>Concentration Area, the methods and timeline within the Farm Environment Plan for reducing nitrogen losses to contribute to the achievement of the nitrate-nitrogen, total nitrogen and ammoniacal nitrogen targets specified in Tables 14(d), 14(f) and 14(g) and for nitrogen loss reductions, by 2030, of 15% from dairy farming activities and 5% from other farming activities-achieving the nitrogen loss reductions set out in Table 14(zc); and</i></p> <p>9. <i>Methods that require the farming activity to operate at or below the Good Management Practice Loss Rate, in any circumstance where the Good Management Practice Loss Rate has not been influenced by severe extraordinary events (including but not limited to droughts and floods) and is less than the Baseline GMP Loss Rate; and</i></p> <p>10. <i>Methods to address any non-compliances identified as a result of a Farm Environment Plan audit, including the timing of any subsequent audits;</i></p> <p>11. <i>Reporting of estimated nutrient losses and audit results of the Farm Environment Plan to the Canterbury Regional Council, including via the Farm Portal."</i></p>
A49	Section 14.5 – Rules – Individual Farming Activities – Rule 14.5.20 (discretionary activity)	152	Support	This OTOP sub-regional rule is similar to a region-wide rule for farming enterprises in the Red Nutrient Allocation Zone which provides for farming enterprises as a restricted discretionary activity (Rule 5.46). The conditions attached to this region-wide rule are the same as those attached to the OTOP sub-region rule, except that it is not necessary for the sub-	Retain Rule 14.5.20, including the rule's discretionary activity status, as notified.

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				regional rule to refer to Nutrient Allocation Zones in Condition 3. For this reason, the proposed restricted discretionary activity rule for farming enterprises is considered appropriate.	
A50	Section 14.5 – Rules – Individual Farming Activities – Rule 14.5.21 (non-complying activity)	152	Support	<p>This OTOP sub-regional rule is similar to a region-wide rule for farming activities in the Red Nutrient Allocation Zone which provides for farming activities (or enterprises) as a non-complying activity, where the activity does not comply with specific conditions of specific rules (Rule 5.47).</p> <p>The conditions attached to this region-wide rule are effectively the same as those attached to the OTOP sub-region rule (i.e., where a FEP has not been prepared or the farming activity is not in the same surface water catchment). For this reason, the proposed non-complying activity rule for farming activities is considered appropriate.</p>	Retain Rule 14.5.21, including the rule's non-complying activity status, as notified.
A51	Section 14.5 – Rules – Individual Farming Activities – Rule 14.5.22 (prohibited activity)	152	Support	<p>This OTOP sub-regional rule is similar to a region-wide rule prohibiting farming activities in the Red Nutrient Allocation Zone where the nitrogen loss exceeds the nitrogen baseline or the Baseline GMP Loss Rate after 1 July 2020 (Rule 5.48), and provided the alternative consent pathway does not apply (Sub. Refs. A43 to A45 above).</p> <p>As this is the operative region-wide rule hierarchy in the LWRP under such circumstances, for the purposes of consistency, the proposed prohibited activity status under this rule is appropriate.</p> <p>While saying this, given the ongoing issues with the Farm Portal (as outlined in paragraphs 2.6 to 2.11 of this submission), Ravensdown considers that it is important that the alternative consent pathway provided for within the LWRP, and proposed in PPC7,</p>	Retain Rule 14.5.22, including the rule's prohibited activity status, as notified.

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				is retained. Otherwise, given the Farm Portal issues, if this rule was to be relied upon without the alternative consent pathway, some farming activities would be prohibited under this rule.	
A52	Section 14.5 – Rules – Irrigation Schemes – Rule 14.5.23 (discretionary activity)	153	Support in part	<p>Except for Condition 1 of this rule, this OTOP sub-regional rule is similar to a region-wide rule that provides for the discharge of nutrients from irrigation schemes and principal water supplies as a discretionary activity (Rule 5.62).</p> <p>The amendment to this rule, namely the deletion of Condition 1 attached to this rule, arises out of Ravensdown’s submission point/s which requests the deletion of Table 14(zc) (Sub. Ref. A58) and thus the associated staged percentage reductions in nitrogen losses.</p> <p>For the above reasons, this rule and the proposed discretionary activity status, subject to the deletion of Condition 1, is considered appropriate.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 14.5.23 as follows:</p> <p><i>“The discharge of nutrients onto or into land in circumstances that may result in a contaminant entering water that would otherwise contravene s15(1) of the RMA, where the applicant is an irrigation scheme or a principal water supplier or the holder of the discharge permit will be an irrigation scheme or a principal water supplier, is a discretionary activity provided the following condition is met:</i></p> <p><i>1. The staged reductions in nitrogen loss required by Table 14(zc) will be met for any land within a High Nitrogen Concentration Area.</i></p> <p><i>Notification</i></p> <p><i>Pursuant to section 95A and 95B of the RMA an application for resource consent under this rule will be processed and considered without public or limited notification.</i></p> <p><i>Note: That limited notification to affected order holders in terms of section 95F of the RMA will be necessary, where relevant, under section 95B(3) of the RMA.”</i></p>
A53	Section 14.5 – Rules – Irrigation Schemes – Rule 14.5.23A (non-complying activity)	153	Oppose	As Ravensdown has requested the deletion of Condition 1 of Rule 14.5.23 (refer above – Sub. Ref. A52), this rule is no longer necessary and should be deleted.	<p>Delete Rule 14.5.23A as follows:</p> <p><i>“The discharge of nutrients onto or into land in circumstances that may result in a contaminant entering water that would otherwise contravene s15(1) of the RMA where the applicant is an irrigation scheme or a principal water supplier or</i></p>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
					<i>the holder of the discharge permit will be an irrigation scheme or a principal water supplier that does not comply with condition 1 of Rule 14.5.23 is a non-complying activity."</i>
A54	Section 14.5 – Rules – Incidental Nutrient Discharges – Rule 14.5.24 (permitted activity)	153	Support	PPC7B introduces a suite of new nutrient related rules for farming activities in the OTOP sub-region. The inclusion of this rule, that permits incidental nutrient discharges from activities which are permitted or authorised by way of a resource consent within the OTOP sub-region, is consistent with the approach adopted within the region-wide rule framework.	Retain the amendment to Rule 14.5.24 as notified.
A55	Section 14.5 – Rules – Incidental Nutrient Discharges – Rule 14.5.24A (non-complying activity)	153	Support	Non-complying activity status for these activities where they are not permitted under Rule 14.5.24 is consistent with the approach adopted within the region-wide rules.	Retain the amendment to Rule 14.5.24A as notified.
A56	Section 14.5 – Rules – Stock Exclusion from Waterbodies – Rule 14.5.25	154	Support in part	<p>Region-wide Rules 5.68A and 5.78B identifies where the stock exclusion rules apply in relation to braided rivers and artificial lakes. Region-wide rules 5.69 to 5.71 then specify that stock within the bed and banks of lakes, rivers and wetlands, subject to conditions, are non-complying or prohibited activities.</p> <p>On this basis, this proposed new rule also restricts or prohibits stock from accessing springs and artificial watercourses that discharge into surface water bodies, where permitted activity Rule 5.61 does not apply.</p> <p>As noted above in relation to Policies 14.4.15 and 14.4.16 (Sub. Refs. A31 and A32), while the intent of the rule is supported by Ravensdown, it is considered that there is the potential for on-ground</p>	While recognising that there may be implementation challenges for farmers in relation to this rule, retain Rule 14.5.25 as notified.

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				implementation challenges for the farming community arising out of this rule.	
A57	Section 14.5 – Rules – Stock Exclusion from Waterbodies – Rule 14.5.25A	154	Support in part	<p>Rule 5.71 prohibits farmed cattle, farmed deer and farmed pigs from using the bed and banks of lakes or rivers within the specific sensitive area identified in Conditions (1) to (4). The inclusion of the Mātaitai Protection Zone as an additional sensitive area where this rule applies, is considered appropriate.</p> <p>As noted above in relation to Policies 14.4.15 and 14.4.16 (Sub. Refs. A31 and A32), while the intent of the rule is supported by Ravensdown, it is considered that there may be the potential for on-ground implementation challenges for the farming community arising out of this rule.</p>	While recognising that there may be implementation challenges for farmers in relation to this rule, retain Rule 14.5.25A as notified.
A58	Section 14.6 – Allocation and Water Quality Limits – Table 14(zc) – Staged Reductions in Nitrogen Loss for Farming Activities in High Nitrogen Concentration Area	173	Oppose	<p>As noted above in various submissions, it is acknowledged that the three HNCAs and that nitrogen loss reductions, including from farming activities, is required to achieve water quality targets is appropriate. However, the aim of any nitrogen loss reductions should be to achieve, on a cumulative basis, the relevant water quality targets and Ravensdown’s proposed farm specific nitrogen loss reductions by 2030, not the continued staged percentage reductions specified in this table.</p> <p>As outlined in Ravensdown’s submission on the draft OTOP ZIPA, Ravensdown supported the need for farming activities to reduce diffuse nitrogen losses, in the HNCAs. However, the submission identified that nitrogen loss reductions, as proposed by Ravensdown, may still be challenging for some farmers, will have the potential to erode land values and may affect some farmers’ ability to remain in business.</p>	<p>Delete Table 14(zc),</p> <p>AND, as consequential amendments throughout PPC7B, to remove all references to Table 14(zc).</p>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				<p>Given the concerns outlined above, Ravensdown does not support the continued staged reductions outlined in Table 14(zc). Rather the focus of the OTOP sub-regional provisions in relation to farming activities and the reduction of nitrogen losses should be on achieving the freshwater outcomes being sought (i.e., achieving the water quality targets and the farm type specific nitrogen loss percentage reductions up to 2030).</p> <p>For these reasons, the deletion of Table 14(zc) is requested and all associated references to percentage nitrogen loss reductions by farming activities.</p>	
PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 7C (WAIMAKARIRI SUB-REGION) (Section 8 of the LWRP)					
A59	Planning Maps – Nitrate Priority Area – New Layer	7	Oppose	<p>While Ravensdown generally supports the identification, and subsequent use, of the NPA within the Waimakariri sub-region as a planning tool to be used to trigger a more focussed regulatory framework for the reduction of nitrates, as outlined in paragraphs 2.25 and 2.26 of this submission, Ravensdown does have concerns about aspects of the NPA, as notified.</p> <p>The Waimakariri ZIPA identified in Map 3.1 (p.29) the proposed extent of the proposed 'Nitrate Priority Management Area'. The notified NPA seems to extend this area, in places, along the northern boundary beyond that identified in the Waimakariri ZIPA. The section 32 Report identifies that as the "... <i>provisions are proposed specifically to manage risks to Christchurch's aquifers. ... widening the spatial extent of the Nitrate Priority Area to include the majority of the modelled source area ...</i>" is required (p.298 of the section 32 Report).</p>	Amend the Nitrate Priority Area to the area identified as the 'Nitrate Priority Management Area_Rev 1' in Map 3.1 of the Waimakariri ZIPA (on p.29).

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				<p>In relation to the extent of the NPA and the area's reported connection to the aquifer that supplies water to Christchurch City, Ravensdown is aware of additional analysis commissioned by DairyNZ which suggests that this potential connection between the NPA and the Christchurch aquifer may be more nebulous than reported.</p> <p>On this basis, Ravensdown opposes the notified extent of the NPA which extends in places, particularly the northern boundary, beyond that identified in the Waimakariri ZIPA. Also, the Waimakariri ZIPA did not identify sub-areas A to E as proposed in PPC7. As the scientific justification for these changes may not be well founded, Ravensdown considers that the extent of the NPA should be consistent with that identified in the Waimakariri ZIPA. This is principally due to the potential issues associated with modelling that underpins the identification of these areas, as well as the fact that Waimakariri ZIPA effectively advised the farming community covered by the identified area of the potential future implications for their farming activities.</p>	
A60	Planning Maps – Nitrate Priority Sub-areas (A, B, C, D, E) – New Layer	7	Oppose	<p>As outlined above (Sub. Ref. A59), while Ravensdown generally support the identification, and subsequent use, of the NPA within the Waimakariri sub-region as a planning tool to be used to trigger a more focussed regulatory framework for the reduction of nitrates, the creation of the sub-areas is opposed.</p> <p>Based on additional analysis commissioned by DairyNZ, Ravensdown understands that the modelling, upon which reportedly the establishment of the sub-areas A to E is based, may not reflect</p>	<p>Delete the Nitrate Priority Area Sub-areas (A, B, C, D, E) new layer map from PPC7.</p> <p>And, as a consequential amendment ensure that all references to the Nitrate Priority Area Sub-areas (A, B, C, D, E) are deleted from PPC7.</p>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				reality. For this reason, and also as a matter of natural justice, the NPA should be consistent with that identified in the Waimakariri ZIPA (i.e., with no sub-areas).	
A61	Figure – Waimakariri sub-region	56 and 57	Support	The replacement figure (and Council's online Canterbury maps) clearly identifies the area over which the sub-regional provisions contained in Section 14 of the LWRP applies. This provides clarity for resource users.	Retain the amendment (deletion and insertion of new figure) to the Waimakariri sub-region figure as notified.
A62	Zone Committee	57 and 58	Support	This section contains an accurate overview of the Waimakariri ZIPA recommendations. As this overview establishes the basis for the development of PPC7C's provisions, the inclusion of this overview within the Waimakariri sub-regional provisions of the LWRP is considered appropriate.	Retain the description of Zone Committee recommendations, or outcomes, as notified.
A63	What this Plan does	59	Support	This section contains an accurate overview of proposed Waimakariri sub-regional provisions arising out of the Waimakariri ZIPA. In particular, four of the bullet points, which reflect the matters of interest to Ravensdown are supported, particularly as they reflect aims which Ravensdown has endeavoured to accommodate with its submissions on PPC7C. The relevant bullet points are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “... • <i>establish a Nitrate Priority Area where the focus is on reducing nitrogen losses over time to achieve target nitrate-nitrogen concentrations in surface and groundwater within the Waimakariri sub-region, and on managing risks of future increases in nitrate-nitrogen in waterbodies outside the Waimakariri sub-region (including</i> 	Retain the description of 'What this Plan does', as notified.

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				<p><i>waterbodies in the coastal marine area, the mainstem of the Waimakariri River, and waterbodies in the Christchurch-West Melton sub-region)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • <i>set water quality outcomes and limits for rivers, lakes, groundwater and community drinking water within the sub-region</i> • <i>require stock to be excluded from a broader range of waterbodies within the sub-region</i> • ... • <i>support ongoing monitoring of water quality, including monitoring of nitrate-nitrogen concentrations in waterbodies, to inform future management of land uses."</i> 	
A64	Section 8.1A – Waimakariri Sub-region Definitions	60 to 61	Oppose in part	PPC7C introduces a range of Waimakariri sub-region specific terminology that is not used elsewhere in the LWRP (for example, 'Nitrate Priority Area' and 'Nitrate Priority Sub-area'). For ease of use of the LWRP as a whole, it would be of assistance to resource users if similar terminology to that used elsewhere in the region could also be utilised in this section of the LWRP.	Consideration is given to changing or amending definitions to ensure more alignment with terminology used throughout the LWRP.
A65	Section 8.4 – Policies – Freshwater Management Units – Policy 8.4.4	62	Support in part	The establishment of the proposed two FMUs, and associated water quality and quantity limits and targets, appropriately reflects the requirements of the National Objectives Framework of the NPS-FM. However, for the purpose of clarity, it is considered that the policy should be amended to reflect the fact that where limits (and targets) are being achieved, water quality (or quantity) maintenance, not improvement, is a valid resource management response.	Amend Policy 8.4.4 as follows: <i>"Management of freshwater in the Waimakariri sub-region is achieved through the establishment of two Freshwater Management Units and the <u>maintenance and</u> improvements in freshwater <u>quality and quantity</u> attained through setting of, and managing to, water quality and quantity <u>limits and targets</u> for each area."</i>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
A66	Section 8.4 – Policies – Nutrient Management – Policy 8.4.25	66	Support in part	<p>The identification, within part (a) of this policy, that further restrictions (beyond that contained within region-wide provisions) are to be placed on farming in the sub-region is consistent with the recommendations of the Waimakariri ZIPA. Ravensdown supports this policy intent and the subsequent rules that evolve from this policy.</p> <p>As discussed in paragraphs 2.25 and 2.26 of this submission, Ravensdown supports the establishment of a NPA where the focus is to reduce nitrogen losses over time to achieve the nitrate-nitrogen targets within the Waimakariri sub-region.</p> <p>Therefore, the aim of any nitrogen loss reductions should be to achieve, on a cumulative basis, the relevant water quality targets, not the continued staged percentage reductions specified in Table 8-9, or continual annual nitrogen losses as proposed in part (b) of this policy. In this regard, it is noted that Ravensdown is requesting the deletion of Table 8-9. and consequential amendments throughout PPC7 (Sub. Ref. A97).</p> <p>However, as also stated in earlier submission points, Ravensdown also considers that nitrogen loss reductions, by 2030, of 15% from dairy farming activities and 5% for other farming activities are achievable and thus should be applied within the sub-region.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 8.4.25 as follows:</p> <p><i>“Nitrate-nitrogen limits for the Waimakariri sub-region are achieved, and potential future impacts on the nitrate-nitrogen concentrations of waterbodies outside the Waimakariri Sub-region are managed by:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>further restricting, relative to the region-wide rules, the area of land used for a farming activity as a permitted activity, and the area of winter grazing that may occur as a permitted activity; and</i> <i>requiring within the Nitrate Priority Area, further reductions in nitrogen loss from farming activities (including farming activities managed by an irrigation scheme or principal water supplier) <u>are required to contribute to the achievement of the nitrate-nitrogen and total nitrogen targets specified in Tables 8-5, 8-6 and 8-8, and, by 2030, for nitrogen losses from dairy farming activities to be reduced by 15% and from all other farming activities by 5%</u>in accordance with Table 8-9, provided that any further stage of reduction required is greater than 3 kg of nitrogen per hectare per year for dairy, or 1 kg of nitrogen per hectare per year for all other farming activities.”</i>
A67	Section 8.4 – Policies – Nutrient Management – Policy 8.4.26	66 and 67	Support in part	<p>As discussed above in relation to a similar OTOP sub-regional policy (Policy 14.4.20 – Sub. Ref. A36), there are two key considerations associated with this policy.</p> <p>Firstly, the policy recognises that for some of the farming activities in the Waimakariri sub-region, the</p>	<p>Amend Policy 8.4.26 as follows:</p> <p><i>“Within the Waimakariri sub-region only consider granting an application for resource consent to exceed the Baseline GMP Loss Rate where:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>the Baseline GMP Loss Rate has been lawfully exceeded prior to 20 July 2019 and the</i>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				<p>farm may not be able to meet the calculated Baseline GMP Loss Rate generated by the Farm Portal. It is appropriate to provide for the consenting of these activities in accordance with parts (a) and (b) of this policy, as it would be inappropriate to prohibit continued (and unchanged) farming based on a theoretical Farm Portal calculation.</p> <p>In relation to part (c) and as stated in earlier submission points, the aim of any nitrogen loss reductions from farming activities within the NPA (that require resource consents) should be to achieve, on a cumulative basis, the relevant water quality targets, not the continued percentage reductions specified in Table 8-9. However, Ravensdown also considers that nitrogen loss reductions, by 2030, of 15% from dairy farming activities and 5% for other farming activities are achievable and thus should be applied within the sub-region.</p>	<p><i>application for resource consent contains evidence that directly and specifically establishes that the exceedance was lawful; and</i></p> <p><i>b. the nitrogen loss calculation remains below the lesser of either the Good Management Practice Loss Rate or the nitrogen loss calculation that occurred in the four years prior to 20 July 2019; and</i></p> <p><i>c. for properties within the Nitrate Priority Area, the applicant demonstrates through actions and a timeframe set out in the Farm Environment Plan, how any further <u>nitrogen loss reductions will be implemented to contribute to the achievement of the nitrate-nitrogen and total nitrogen targets specified in Tables 8-5, 8-6 and 8-8 and, by 2030, for nitrogen losses from dairy farming activities to be reduced by 15% and from all other farming activities by 5% required by Table 8-9 will be achieved.</u>"</i></p>
A68	Section 8.4 – Policies – Nutrient Management – Policy 8.4.27	67	Support in part	<p>This policy, similar to Policy 14.4.20A for the OTOP sub-region (Sub. Ref. A37), accommodates the fact that it may not be possible for some farming activities to reduce nitrogen losses, within the NPA, in accordance with the specific continued staged percentage reductions identified in the Waimakariri ZIPA and thus accommodated within the notified PPC7C. Given this recognition, the policy outlines in parts (a) to (e) the matters to be considered when processing farming activity applications in the NPA where the requirements of Policy 8.4.26(c) are not being met. The matters include: consideration of</p>	<p>Amend Policy 8.4.27as follows:</p> <p><i>"Where an application for a land use consent for a farming activity demonstrates the nitrogen loss rate reductions required by Policy 8.4.26(c) are unable may not be able to be achieved by the dates specified in Table 8-9, any application for an extension of time to achieve those reductions will be considered having regard to:</i></p> <p><i>a. the Baseline GMP Loss Rate and the level of any enduring nitrogen loss rate reduction already achieved; and</i></p> <p><i>b. the nature and extent of any mitigations</i></p>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				<p>reductions already achieved; proposed mitigations that are better than GMP; the costs of achieving reductions in relation to farming viability and the benefit or spreading investment over time; the nature of steps proposed; and, progress to achieving the relevant nitrate-nitrogen limits and targets.</p> <p>Ravensdown considers that matters listed are appropriate, in that reductions are encouraged while ensuring that farming activities remain financially viable. The policy also appropriately focusses on achieving water quality limits and targets, not percentage reductions, which is consistent with Ravensdown's submission in relation the requested deletion of Table 8-9) (Sub. Ref. A97) and all related provisions.</p>	<p><i>implemented during the nitrogen baseline period that are better than Good Management Practice, and the extent to which these have been effective in minimising nitrogen losses; and</i></p> <p><i>c. the capital and operational costs of achieving the nitrogen loss rate reductions and the benefit (in terms of maintaining a farming activity's financial viability) of spreading that investment over time; and</i></p> <p><i>d. the nature, sequencing, measurability, effectiveness and enforceability of any steps proposed to achieve the nitrogen loss rate reductions; and</i></p> <p><i>e. progress made towards achieving nitrate-nitrogen limits and targets in Tables 8-5, 8-6, 8-7 and 8-8"</i></p>
A69	Section 8.4 – Policies – Nutrient Management – Policy 8.4.28	67	Support	Ensuring that adverse effects, from farming activities greater than 5ha, on ecological health and cultural values associated with surface waterbodies in the Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka) and Coastal Protection Zone is considered appropriate. This policy, and related controlled activity rule (Rule 8.5.25 – Sub. Ref. A86), enables potential effects on these values from farming activities, particularly winter grazing and irrigation, to be managed through an audited FEP.	Retain Policy 6.4.28 as notified.
A70	Section 8.4 – Policies – Nutrient Management – Policy 8.4.28A	67	Support	Given the significance of the Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka) and Coastal Protection Zone, and the need to avoid adverse effects on the ecological health and cultural values of the surface waterbodies in these areas (as provided for by Policy 8.4.28 above – Sub. Ref. A69), the guidance provided by this policy is considered appropriate. This includes: the	Retain Policy 8.4.28A as notified.

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				preference to avoid discharges to surface water; and where this is not achieved to minimise the discharge of contaminants in a manner that achieves the relevant water quality outcomes and water quality limits.	
A71	Section 8.4 – Policies – Nutrient Management – Policy 8.4.28B	67	Support	This policy appropriately recognises that for many farming activities and/or in some locations, the Farm Portal cannot generate accurate a Baseline GMP Loss Rate or Good Management Practice Loss Rate. Given this issue, the provision of an alternative consent pathway, which this policy provides for, is appropriate.	Retain Policy 8.4.24B as notified.
A72	Section 8.4 – Policies – Nutrient Management – Policy 8.4.28C	68	Support	<p>This policy is connected to the alternative consent pathway policy (Policy 8.4.28B – refer to Sub. Ref. A71 above), provided for within PPC7, where the Farm Portal cannot generate an accurate Baseline GMP Loss Rate or Good Management Practice Loss Rate.</p> <p>This policy specifies that a review condition is to be attached to resource consents granted under the alternative consent pathway. The review condition is to be linked to when the Farm Portal can generate the relevant loss rates. The use of such a review clause is appropriate as it will ensure that farming activities in the sub-region are all operating in accordance with consistent obligations.</p>	Retain Policy 8.4.28C as notified.
A73	Section 8.4 – Policies – Livestock Exclusion from Waterbodies – Policy 8.4.30	68 and 69	Support in part	The Waimakariri ZIPA contains recommendations in relation to improving stream health. Two of these recommendations entail, for the purposes of stock exclusion as addressed in the LWRP, the identification that in the Waimakariri sub-region rivers include springheads and drains and watercourses that discharge into surface waterbodies (Rec. 1.15 and	While recognising that there may be implementation challenges for farmers in relation to the intent of this policy, retain Policy 8.4.30 as notified.

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				1.16). While the intent of the policy is supported by Ravensdown, it is considered that there is the potential for on-ground implementation challenges for the farming community arising out of this policy.	
A74	Section 8.4 – Policies – Livestock Exclusion from Waterbodies – Policy 8.4.31	69	Support in part	In addition to the Waimakariri sub-regional stock exclusion provisions identified in Policy 8.4.30 above (Sub. Ref. A73), this proposed policy identifies that stock exclusion from springs, rivers and lakes and the beds and banks of water bodies, and larger animals in in the Ashley-Waimakariri Plains Area, is required to protect Ngāi Tūāhuriri values and to reduce diffuse discharges to surface water and the degradation of aquatic ecosystems. This policy is consistent with a number of the recommendations of the Waimakariri ZIPA. As outlined above (Sub. Ref. A73), while the intent of the policy is supported, it is considered that there is the potential for on-ground implementation challenges for the farming community arising out of this policy.	While recognising that there may be implementation challenges for farmers in relation to the intent of this policy, retain Policy 8.4.31 as notified.
A75	Section 8.4 – Policies – Current Information, Monitoring and Review – Policy 8.4.35	69 and 70	Support	Ongoing monitoring and investigations into the state of the sub-regions waterbodies, and whether or not the freshwater outcomes and limits are being achieved, as outlined in this policy, is considered appropriate. Without this ongoing work, it will not be possible to determine whether the PPC7 provisions are working effectively and/or if further refinement and amendment of these provisions are required in the future.	Retain Policy 8.4.23 as notified.
A76	Section 8.4 – Policies – Consent	70	Support in part	The proposed common expiry date identified in this policy of 2037 (or 2047 for consents which expire	While it is considered that this policy may result in resourcing issues arising, provided a queuing system

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
	Expiry and Duration – Policy 8.4.36			<p>after 2030 and which are affected by section 124 of the RMA), is proposed as it is aligned with the anticipated 2032 notification of the next plan change.</p> <p>While not opposing this policy, it is noted that this policy (and Policy 8.4.37 below – Sub. Ref. A77) effectively means that potentially a significant number of resource consents in the sub-region will expire at the same time. This will trigger the need for resource consent applications to be prepared and for the farming community, the need to also update FEPs, nutrient budgets etc. As noted elsewhere in various submission points, this has the potential to result in resourcing issues, as was the case when PC5 to the LWRP became operative. Given this potential issue, Ravensdown requests that Council continue to operate a queuing system so as to ensure that resource users, including farmers, are not penalised (including in relation to section 124 of the RMA considerations) when it is not their fault that relevant professionals and/or technical experts are not available to carry out all the work at the same time.</p>	is operated by Council (or similar), retain Policy 8.4.36 as notified.
A77	Section 8.4 – Policies – Consent Expiry and Duration – Policy 8.4.37	70	Support in part	<p>While Ravensdown does not necessarily oppose the minimum 10-year consent terms proposed under this policy, as outlined above in relation to Policy 8.4.36 (Sub. Ref. A76), there are potential resourcing issues associated with the combination of 10-year consents and associated common expiry dates.</p> <p>Given this potential issue, Ravensdown requests that Council continue to operate a queuing system so as to ensure that resource users, including farmers, are not penalised when it is not their fault that relevant professionals and/or technical experts are not available to carry out all the work at the same time.</p>	While it is considered that this policy may result in resourcing issues arising, provided a queuing system is operated by Council (or similar), retain Policy 8.4.36 as notified.

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
A78	Section 8.5 – Rules – Nutrient Management - Note	80	Support	<p>A new note to the sub-regional rules for nutrient management clarifies that commercial vegetable growing operations are regulated by region-wide rules (Rules 5.42CA to 5.42CE), rather than any sub-regional rules.</p> <p>This clarification is required for PPC7 and the LWRP to work effectively.</p>	Retain the new 'Nutrient Management' note contained in Section 8.5 of the LWRP as notified.
A79	Section 8.5 – Rules – Nutrient Management – Rule 8.5.21 (permitted activity)	80	Support	<p>Proposed new permitted activity Rule 8.5.21 permits all farming activities on a property of 5ha or less within the Waimakariri sub-region. There are no conditions attached to this rule.</p> <p>This is the equivalent, albeit with a reduced threshold of 5ha rather than 10ha, to a similar permitted activity rule in the region-wide provisions of the LWRP. As outlined in paragraph 2.32 of this submission, the reduced 5ha threshold was recommended in the Waimakariri ZIPA (Rec. 3.11) as one of the means of reducing nitrates within the sub-region. The reason for the proposed threshold reduction is in order to ensure additional regulation, and thus control of winter grazing activities. The provision of a permitted activity rule for farming activity (and subject no conditions), albeit at a lower threshold than that provided for within the region-wide rules, given the nitrate issues in the Waimakariri sub-region, is considered appropriate.</p> <p>While supporting this rule, it is noted that the section 32 Report identifies that it is estimated, given the reduced area thresholds, that an additional 50 farming properties in the sub-region will need to seek resource consents. As noted elsewhere in various submission points, this change may give rise to resourcing issues when resource consents are sought,</p>	Retain Rule 8.5.21, including the rule's permitted activity status, as notified.

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				as was the case when PC5 to the LWRP became operative. Given this potential issue, Ravensdown requests that Council continue to operate a queuing system so as to ensure that farmers are not penalised for non-compliance when it is not their fault that relevant professionals and/or technical experts are not available to carry out all the work at the same time.	
A80	Section 8.5 – Rules – Nutrient Management – Rule 8.5.22	80	Support in part	<p>The clarifying note, or rather rule, subject to one amendment, clarifies that any different requirements for farming activities in relation to nitrogen loss reductions within the NPA only relates to the part of the farm located within the NPA. This is logical and thus appropriate.</p> <p>The one amendment arises out of Ravensdown's submission point/s which requests the deletion of Table 8-9 (Sub. Ref. A97) and associated percentage reductions in nitrogen losses.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 8.5.22 as follows:</p> <p><i>"Where any property or Farming Enterprise includes land within the Nitrate Priority Area, the nitrogen loss reductions in Table 8-9 requirements only apply to that part of the property within the Nitrate Priority Area."</i></p>
A81	Section 8.5 – Rules – Nutrient Management – Rule 8.5.23	80	Oppose	<p>As outlined above in relation to the NPA and sub-area Planning Maps (Sub. Refs. A59 and A60), while Ravensdown generally support the identification, and subsequent use, of the NPA within the Waimakariri sub-region as a planning tool to be used to trigger a more focussed regulatory framework for the reduction of nitrates, the creation of the sub-areas is opposed.</p> <p>Ravensdown has therefore requested the deletion of all references to the NPA sub-areas in PPC7. On this basis, Rule 8.5.23 also needs to be deleted.</p>	<p>Delete Rule 8.5.23 as follows:</p> <p><i>"Where any property or Farming Enterprise includes land within more than one Nitrate Priority sub-area, the required reduction in nitrogen loss for each sub-area is applied only to that part of the property that is within the sub-area."</i></p>
A82	Section 8.5 – Rules – Nutrient Management –	81	Support	This rule, and subsequent Rules 8.5.23B and 8.5.23C (Sub. Refs. A83 and A84), reflect the alternative consent pathway provided for under Policy 8.4.28B	Retain Rule 8.5.23A, including the rule's discretionary activity status, as notified.

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
	Rule 8.5.23A (discretionary activity)			(Sub. Ref. A71). These rules are also consistent with the region-wide alternative consent pathway provided for by Rules 5.42A to 5.42C. For these reasons, this rule is appropriate as proposed.	
A83	Section 8.5 – Rules – Nutrient Management – Rule 8.5.23B (non-complying activity)	81	Support	This rule, as well as Rules 8.5.23A and 8.5.23C (Sub. Refs. A82 and A84), reflects the alternative consent pathway provided for under Policy 8.4.28B (Sub. Ref. A71). These rules are also consistent with the region-wide alternative consent pathway provided for by Rules 5.42A to 5.42C. For these reasons, this rule is appropriate as proposed.	Retain Rule 8.5.23B, including the rule's non-complying activity status, as notified.
A84	Section 8.5 – Rules – Nutrient Management – Rule 8.5.23C (prohibited activity)	81 and 82	Support	This rule, as well as Rules 8.5.23A and 8.5.23B (Sub. Refs. A82 and A83), reflect the alternative consent pathway provided for under Policy 8.5.28B (Sub. Ref. A71). These rules are also consistent with the region-wide alternative consent pathway rules provided for by Rules 5.42A to 5.42C, including prohibited activity status under Rule 5.42C. For these reasons, this rule is appropriate as proposed.	Retain Rule 8.5.23C, including the rule's prohibited activity status, as notified.
A85	Section 8.5 – Rules – Nutrient Management – Rule 8.5.24 (permitted activity)	82	Support in part	<p>This Waimakariri sub-regional rule is similar to a region-wide rule for farming activities in the Red Nutrient Allocation Zone which permits farming activities which have lesser effects on nutrient losses than other farming activities (Rule 5.44). For this reason, the proposed permitted activity rule is considered appropriate.</p> <p>However, consistent with the Waimakariri ZIPA recommendations all relevant nutrient management Waimakariri sub-region rules contains a lower farm size threshold of 5ha and associated restrictions on the extent of winter grazing has been applied. Also, Condition 4 restricts some specific farming related activities within the Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka) and</p>	<p>Amend Rule 8.5.24 as follows:</p> <p><i>“The use of land for a farming activity on a property greater than 5 hectares in area is a permitted activity, provided the following conditions are met:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. The property is registered in the Farm Portal by 20 July 2022 and information about the farming activity and the property is reviewed and updated by the property owner or their agent, every 36 months thereafter or whenever a material change in the land use associated with the farming activity occurs, or whenever any boundary of the property is</i>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				<p>the Coastal Protection Zone. Given the specific issues in the sub-region which these conditions are aiming to address, these conditions are also considered appropriate.</p> <p>This rule also places restrictions on the extent of irrigation (Condition 3(a)). This condition is generally consistent with Conditions 2 and 3 of Rule 5.44, although it has been restructured. However, to ensure consistency between Condition 2 and 3 of Rule 5.44 and Condition 3(a) of this consent, the reference to no more than 50 hectares needs to be amended to refer to the area authorised to be irrigated.</p>	<p><i>changed; and</i></p> <p>2. <i>A Management Plan in accordance with Schedule 7A has been prepared, implemented, and supplied to the Canterbury Regional Council on request; and</i></p> <p>3. <i>For any property located outside the Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka) and Coastal Protection Zone, or for any property located within the Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka) and Coastal Protection Zone that does not directly adjoin the bed of any river or coastal lake:</i></p> <p><i>a. Any increase in the area of the property that is irrigated is limited to 10 hectares above that which was irrigated at 20 July 2019, provided that no more than 50 hectares is <u>authorised to be</u> irrigated in total; and</i></p> <p><i>b. The total area of the property used for winter grazing is less than or equal to:</i></p> <p><i>i. 5 hectares for any property less than 100 hectares in area; or</i></p> <p><i>ii. 5% of the area of the property, for any property between 100 and 1000 hectares in area; or</i></p> <p><i>iii. 50 hectares, for any property greater than 1000 hectares in area; and</i></p> <p>4. <i>For any property located within the Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka) and Coastal Protection Zone, that includes or directly adjoins a river or coastal lake, there is no irrigation or winter grazing on any part of the property."</i></p>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
A86	Section 8.5 – Rules – Nutrient Management – Rule 8.5.25 (controlled activity)	82 and 83	Support in part	<p>This rule provides for farming activities, as a controlled activity, within the Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka) and the Coastal Protection Zone in the Waimakariri sub-region as Condition 4 of Rule 8.5.24 is not complied with. The conditions attached to this controlled activity rule (subject to one amendment), and the matters of over which control are reserved and generally consistent, except for the necessary sub-region specific information, with the approach provided for in the relevant region-wide controlled activity rules.</p> <p>However, as addressed above in relation to Rule 8.5.24 (Sub. Ref. A85), Condition 3 of this rule needs to be amended to refer to the maximum area of irrigation authorised to be irrigated.</p> <p>Given the proposed amendment to Condition 3, it is considered that Condition 2 repeats the requirements of Condition 2. Therefore, Condition 2 is unnecessary and can be deleted.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 8.5.25 as follows:</p> <p><i>“The use of land for a farming activity on a property greater than 5 hectares in area that does not comply with condition 4 of Rule 8.5.24 is a controlled activity, provided the following condition is met:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. A Farm Environment Plan has been prepared for the property in accordance with Part A of Schedule 7 and is submitted with the application for resource consent; and</i> <i>2. The area of the property authorised to be irrigated with water is less than 50 hectares; and</i> <i>23. Any increase in the irrigated area of the property is limited to 10 hectares above that which was irrigated at 20 July 2019, provided that no more than 50 hectares are is authorised to be irrigated in total; and</i> <i>34. The total area of the property used for winter grazing is less than or equal to:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. 5 hectares for any property less than 100 hectares in area; or</i> <i>b. 5% of the area of the property, for any property between 100 and 1000 hectares in area; or</i> <i>c. 50 hectares, for any property greater than 1000 hectares in area.</i> <p><i>The CRC reserves control over the following matters:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. The commencement date for the first audit of the Farm Environment Plan; and</i>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
					<p>2. <i>The content, quality and accuracy of the nutrient budgets provided with the application for resource consent; and</i></p> <p>3. <i>The timing of any actions or Good Management Practices proposed to achieve the objectives and targets described in Schedule 7; and</i></p> <p>4. <i>Methods to avoid or mitigate adverse effects of the activity on surface and groundwater quality and sources of drinking water; and</i></p> <p>5. <i>Methods to address any non-compliances identified as a result of a Farm Environment Plan audit, including the timing of any subsequent audits; and</i></p> <p>6. <i>Reporting of audit results of the Farm Environment Plan to the Canterbury Regional Council, including via the Farm Portal; and</i></p> <p>7. <i>The efficacy of any proposals in the Farm Environment Plan to as a first priority, avoid, and where impracticable, mitigate any adverse effects on mahinga kai, wāhi tapu or wāhi taonga"</i></p>
A87	Section 8.5 – Rules – Nutrient Management – Rule 8.5.26 (restricted discretionary activity)	83 and 84	Support in part	<p>Restricted discretionary activity status for farming activities in the Waimakariri region, which are not provided for by Rules 8.5.24 and 8.5.25, is considered appropriate. The conditions attached to this rule, and the associated matters of discretion (except for Matters of Discretion (7) and (8)), are considered appropriate and generally consistent with the approach provided for in the region-wide provisions.</p> <p>The amendments to the Matters of Discretion arises out of Ravensdown's submission point/s which requests the deletion of Table 8-9 (Sub. Ref. A97) and</p>	<p>Amend Rule 8.5.26 as follows:</p> <p><i>"The use of land for a farming activity on a property greater than 5 hectares in area that does not comply with one or more of conditions 1, 2 or 3 of Rule 8.5.24 or one or more of conditions 2, <u>or</u> 3 or 4 of Rule 8.5.25 is a restricted discretionary activity, provided the following conditions are met:</i></p> <p>1. <i>A Farm Environment Plan has been prepared for the property in accordance with Part A of</i></p>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				<p>thus the associated continued staged percentage reductions in nitrogen losses. Rather, as requested within Ravensdown's submissions points, the focus of nitrogen loss reductions in the NPA should be on assisting with the achievement of the water quality targets specified in Tables 8-5, 8-6 and 8-8. However, as also stated in submission points, Ravensdown also considers that nitrogen loss reductions, by 2030, of 15% from dairy farming activities and 5% for other farming activities are achievable and thus should be applied within the sub-region. Matter of Discretion (7) has also been amended to reflect this aim.</p> <p>Also, given the requested deletion to Condition 2 of Rule 8.5.25 (Sub. Ref. A86 above), the associated condition references within this rule are to be amended accordingly.</p>	<p><i>Schedule 7 and is submitted with the application for resource consent; and</i></p> <p>2. <i>Until 30 June 2020, the nitrogen loss calculation for the property does not exceed the nitrogen baseline, and from 1 July 2020 the Baseline GMP Loss Rate unless the nitrogen baseline was lawfully exceeded prior to 20 July 2019, and the application for resource consent demonstrates that the exceedance was lawful.</i></p> <p><i>The exercise of discretion is restricted to the following matters:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. The efficacy of the Farm Environment Plan; and</i> <i>2. The commencement date for the first audit of the Farm Environment Plan; and</i> <i>3. The content, quality and accuracy of the nutrient budgets provided with the application for resource consent; and</i> <i>4. The actual or potential adverse effects of the activity on surface and groundwater quality and sources of drinking water and how these will be avoided or mitigated; and</i> <i>5. The timing of any actions or Good Management Practices proposed to achieve the objectives and targets described in Schedule 7; and</i> <i>6. Methods that limit the nitrogen loss calculation for the farming activity to the Baseline GMP Loss Rate; and</i> <i>7. For land within the Nitrate Priority Management Area, the methods and timeline in the Farm Environment Plan for <u>reducing</u></i>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
					<p><u>nitrogen losses to contribute to the achievement of the nitrate-nitrogen and total nitrogen targets specified in Tables 8-5, 8-6 and 8-8 and, by 2030, for nitrogen losses for dairy farming activities to be reduced by 15% and from all other farming activities by 5% achieving the nitrogen loss rate reductions set out in Table 8-9; and</u></p> <p>8. For land within the Nitrate Priority Area, the extent to which any mitigations better than Good Management Practice implemented during the 2009-13 Baseline period have been taken into account when applying the further reductions in nitrogen loss required by Table 8-9; and</p> <p>9. Methods that require the farming activity to operate at or below the Good Management Practice Loss Rate, in any circumstance where the Good Management Practice Loss Rate has not been influenced by severe extraordinary events (including but not limited to droughts and floods) and is less than the Baseline GMP Loss Rate; and</p> <p>10. Methods to address any non-compliances identified as a result of a Farm Environment Plan audit, including the timing of any subsequent audits;</p> <p>11. Reporting of estimated nutrient losses and audit results of the Farm Environment Plan to the Canterbury Regional Council, including via the Farm Portal; and</p> <p>12. The efficacy of any proposals in the Farm Environment Plan to as a first priority, avoid,</p>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
					<i>and where impracticable, mitigate any adverse effects on mahinga kai, wāhi tapu or wāhi taonga."</i>
A88	Section 8.5 – Rules – Nutrient Management – Rule 8.5.27 (discretionary activity)	84	Support	This Waimakariri sub-regional rule is similar to a region-wide rule for farming enterprises in the Red Nutrient Allocation Zone which provides for farming enterprises as a restricted discretionary activity (Rule 5.46). The conditions attached to this region-wide rule are the same as those attached to the Waimakariri sub-region rule, except that it is not necessary for the sub-regional rule to refer to Nutrient Allocation Zones in Condition 3. For this reason, the proposed restricted discretionary activity rule for farming enterprises is considered appropriate.	Retain Rule 8.5.27, including the rule's discretionary activity status, as notified.
A89	Section 8.5 – Rules – Nutrient Management – Rule 8.5.28 (non-complying activity)	84	Support	This Waimakariri sub-regional rule is similar to a region-wide rule for farming activities in the Red Nutrient Allocation Zone which provides for farming activities (or enterprises) as a non-complying activity, where the activity does not comply with specific conditions of specific rules (Rule 5.47). The conditions attached to this region-wide rule are effectively the same as those attached to the Waimakariri sub-region rule (i.e., where a FEP has not been prepared or the farming activity is not in the same surface water catchment). For this reason, the proposed non-complying activity rule for farming activities is considered appropriate.	Retain Rule 8.5.28, including the rule's non-complying activity status, as notified.
A90	Section 8.5 – Rules – Nutrient Management – Rule 8.5.29	84	Support	This Waimakariri sub-regional rule is similar to a region-wide rule prohibiting farming activities in the Red Nutrient Allocation Zone where the nitrogen loss exceeds the nitrogen baseline or the Baseline GMP Loss Rate after 1 July 2020 (Rule 5.48), and provided	Retain Rule 8.5.29, including the rule's prohibited activity status, as notified.

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
	(prohibited activity)			<p>the alternative consent pathway does not apply (Sub. Refs. A82 to A84 above).</p> <p>As this is the operative region-wide rule hierarchy in the LWRP under such circumstances, for the purposes of consistency, the proposed prohibited activity status under this rule is appropriate.</p> <p>While saying this, given the ongoing issues with the Farm Portal (as outlined in paragraphs 2.6 to 2.11 of this submission), Ravensdown considers that it is important that the alternative consent pathway provided for within the LWRP is retained. Otherwise, given the Farm Portal issues, if this rule was to be relied upon without the alternative consent pathway, some farming activities would be prohibited under this rule.</p>	
A91	Section 8.5 – Rules – Irrigation Schemes – Rule 8.5.30 (discretionary activity)	84 and 85	Support in part	<p>Except for Condition 1 of this rule, this Waimakariri sub-regional rule is similar to a region-wide rule that provides for the discharge of nutrients from irrigation schemes and principal water supplies as a discretionary activity (Rule 5.62).</p> <p>The amendment to this rule, namely the deletion of Condition 1 attached to this rule, arises out of Ravensdown's submission point/s which requests the deletion of Table 8-9 (Sub. Ref. A97) and thus the associated continued staged percentage reductions in nitrogen losses.</p> <p>For the above reasons, this rule and the proposed discretionary activity status, subject to the deletion of Condition 1, is considered appropriate.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 8.5.30 as follows:</p> <p><i>"The discharge of nutrients onto or into land in circumstances that may result in a contaminant entering water that would otherwise contravene s15(1) of the RMA where the applicant is an irrigation scheme or a principal water supplier or the holder of the discharge permit will be an irrigation scheme or a principal water supplier is a discretionary activity provided the following condition is met:</i></p> <p><i>1. The staged reductions in nitrogen loss required by Table 8-9 will be met for any land within the Nitrate Priority Area.</i></p> <p><i>Notification</i></p> <p><i>Pursuant to section 95A and 95B of the RMA an application for resource consent under this rule will be processed and considered without public or</i></p>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
					<p><i>limited notification.</i></p> <p><i>Note: Limited notification to affected order holders in terms of section 95F of the RMA will be necessary, where relevant, under section 95B(3) of the RMA."</i></p>
A92	Section 8.5 – Rules – Irrigation Schemes – Rule 8.5.30A (non-complying activity)	85	Oppose	As Ravensdown has requested the deletion of Condition 1 of Rule 8.5.30 (refer above – Sub. Ref. A91), this rule is no longer necessary and should be deleted.	<p>Delete Rule 8.5.30A as follows:</p> <p><i>"The discharge of nutrients onto or into land in circumstances that may result in a contaminant entering water that would otherwise contravene s15(1) of the RMA where the applicant is an irrigation scheme or a principal water supplier or the holder of the discharge permit will be an irrigation scheme or a principal water supplier that does not comply with condition 1 of Rule 8.5.30 is a non-complying activity."</i></p>
A93	Section 8.5 – Rules – Incidental Nutrient Discharges – Rule 8.5.31 (permitted activity)	85	Support	PPC7C introduces a suite of new nutrient related rules for farming activities in the Waimakariri sub-region. The inclusion of this rule, that permits incidental nutrient discharges from activities which are permitted or authorised by way of a resource consent within the Waimakariri sub-region, is consistent with the approach adopted within the region-wide rule framework.	Retain the amendment to Rule 8.5.31 as notified.
A94	Section 8.5 – Rules – Incidental Nutrient Discharges – Rule 8.5.32 (non-complying activity)	85	Support	Non-complying activity status for these activities where they are not permitted under Rule 8.5.31 is consistent with the approach adopted within the region-wide rules.	Retain the amendment to Rule 8.5.32 as notified.
A95	Section 8.5 – Rules – Stock Exclusion from Waterbodies – Rule 8.5.33	87	Support in part	Region-wide Rules 5.68A and 5.78B identifies where the stock exclusion rules apply in relation to braided rivers and artificial lakes. Region-wide rules 5.69 to 5.71 then specify that stock within the bed and banks	While recognising that there may be implementation challenges for farmers in relation to this rule, retain Rule 8.5.33 as notified.

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				<p>of lakes, rivers and wetlands, subject to conditions, are non-complying or prohibited activities.</p> <p>On this basis, this proposed new rule also restricts or prohibits stock from accessing springs and artificial watercourses that discharge into surface water bodies, where permitted activity Rule 5.61 does not apply.</p> <p>As noted above in relation to Policies 8.4.30 and 8.4.31 (Sub. Refs. A73 and A74), while the intent of the rule is supported by Ravensdown, it is considered that there is the potential for on-ground implementation challenges for the farming community arising out of this rule.</p>	
A96	Section 8.5 – Rules – Stock Exclusion from Waterbodies – Rule 8.5.34	87	Support in part	<p>Rule 5.71 prohibits farmed cattle, farmed deer and farmed pigs from using the bed and banks of lakes or rivers within the specific sensitive area identified in Conditions (1) to (4). The inclusion of the Ashley-Waimakariri Plains Areas as an additional sensitive area where this rule in effect applies, is considered appropriate. As noted above in relation to Policies 8.4.30 and 8.4.31 (Sub. Refs. A73 and A74), while the intent of the rule is supported by Ravensdown, it is considered that there may be the potential for on-ground implementation challenges for the farming community arising out of this rule.</p>	While recognising that there may be implementation challenges for farmers in relation to this rule, retain Rule 8.5.34 as notified.
A97	Section 8.7 – Allocation Limits and Water Quality Limits – Table 8.9 – Nitrate Priority Area Staged Reductions in Nitrogen Loss for	95	Oppose	<p>As noted above in various submissions, it is acknowledged that the NPA is an area where it is appropriate to attempt to reduce nitrogen losses from farming activities in order to achieve the proposed water quality targets. However, the aim of any nitrogen loss reductions should be to achieve, on a cumulative basis, the relevant water quality targets and Ravensdown's proposed farm specific nitrogen</p>	<p>Delete Table 8-9.</p> <p>AND, as consequential amendments throughout PPC7C, to remove all references to Table 8-9.</p>

SUB. REF.	LWRP PPC7 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
	Farming Activities, Farming Enterprises and Irrigation Schemes			<p>loss reductions by 2030, not the continued staged percentage reductions specified in this table.</p> <p>As outlined in Ravensdown's submission on the draft Waimakariri ZIPA, Ravensdown supported the establishment of the NPA and the need for farming activities to reduce diffuse nitrogen losses, in the NPA. However, the submission identified that nitrogen loss reductions, as proposed by Ravensdown, may be a significant challenge for many farmers, have potential impacts on business viability and do need to be scientifically based having considered the economic and practical implications.</p> <p>Given the concerns outlined above, Ravensdown does not support the continued staged reductions outlined in Table 8-9. Rather the focus of the Waimakariri sub-regional provisions in relation to farming activities and the reduction of nitrogen losses should be on achieving the freshwater outcomes being sought (i.e., achieving the water quality targets and the farm type specific nitrogen loss percentage reductions up to 2030).</p> <p>For these reasons, the deletion of Table 8-9 is requested and all associated references to percentage nitrogen loss reductions by farming activities.</p>	

ATTACHMENT B – RAVENSDOWN LIMITED’S SUBMISSIONS ON PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 2 TO THE WAIMAKARIRI RIVER REGIONAL PLAN

SUB. REF.	WRRP PPC2 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
General					
B01	General – All of PPC2 to the WRRP	-	Support	<p>Proposed Plan Change 2 (PPC2) to the Waimakariri River Regional Plan (WRRP) reduces the area covered by the WRRP. PPC2 also clearly identifies that the sub-regional provisions of the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (LWRP) applies over the area that has been removed from the WRRP.</p> <p>The PPC2 amendments ensures that inconsistencies between the WRRP and the LWRP do not arise. This is an appropriate resource management approach.</p>	Retain the amendments to the WRRP, in accordance with PPC2, as notified.
Section 1 – Introduction					
B02	Section 1.3 – Area to which this Plan applies	3	Support	<p>The amended description of the ‘Area to which this Plan applies’ clearly identifies that the WRRP “... <i>excludes the area within the Waimakariri Sub-region as defined in the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (LWRP)</i>”.</p> <p>This statement, in conjunction with the amended WRRP Figure 1 (Sub. Ref. B03 below) and the amended figure contained in Section 8 of the LWRP, clearly identifies which areas of the Waimakariri catchment are management by which regional plan.</p>	Retain the amendment to Section 1.3 (Area to which this Plan applies) as notified.
B03	Figure 1	4 and 5	Support	Consistent with the purpose of PPC2, PPC2 replaces Figure 1 with a new figure that identifies the proposed reduced extent of the area to which the WRRP applies.	Retain the amendment to Figure 1 as notified.
Appendix 1 – Definition of Terms					
B04	Waimakariri River Catchment	37	Support	Consistent with the purpose of PPC2 and the amendments to Section 1.3 and Figure 1 of the WRRP (refer to Sub. Refs B02 and B03 above), the definition	Retain the definition of the ‘Waimakariri River Catchment’ as notified.

SUB. REF.	WRRP PPC2 PROVISION	PAGE	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	COMMENTS	RELIEF SOUGHT
				clearly and consistently identifies that the river catchment, as managed by the WRRP, is identified in Figure 1 and also excludes the area that lies within the coastal marine area. The definition provides additional clarity for resources users.	